India

FOR THE

[No. 4. New Series. / [illegible] Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JANUARY 28, 1899. [Registered as a Newspaper.] {Price [illegible]d. / By Post [illegible]d.

Notes and News 49
Mor[illegible] in International Politics ... 52
The Responsibility for the Failure of the Tirah Expedition, by Colonel H. B. Hanna 53
Mr. Cr[illegible] on the N.-W. Provinces, by R[illegible] C. Dutt, C.I.E. 53
Sitting o[illegible] Safety-Valve 54
The Social Conference 55
Chronicle of the Week 56
The "Forward" Policy:
Meeting at Cardiff 57
Speeches by Mr. Curzon and Lord G. Hamilton 59
Statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer 59
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: Work of the British Committee ... 61
"As Others See Us" 63
Et Caetera 63
Advertisements 64

NOTES AND NEWS.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, in the speech which he delivered on Wednesday night, and which we report on another page, made the astounding assertion, in reply to Mr. Asquith, that the road from Peshawar to Chitral was made by the late Liberal Government.

> The Radical papers (he said) have for the last two years assumed that I am responsible for the construction of that road. I have kept silent; I like my opponents to commit themselves. (A laugh.) The road was not made by me, but by the late Government, and it was in existence before we came into office.

Now, we are not concerned in these columns with any party conflicts in the United Kingdom, and we have on many occasions had to deplore the temporising timidity of Sir Henry Fowler. From our point of view the important thing is that the road was made, and the question, Who made it? is of minor importance. But this statement of Lord George H[illegible]n's is, we say, astounding, viewed in the light of t[illegible]tral Blue-book. At page 51 of that volume (C. 78[illegible]895) we find this telegram, dated June 13, 1895[illegible] Sir Henry Fowler, then Secretary of State for Ind[illegible]e Viceroy:—

> They (Her[illegible]s Government) have decided that no military force or Europ[illegible]t shall be kept at Chitral, that Chitral shall not be fortified, and that no road shall be made between Peshawar and Chitral. It will follow that all positions beyond our frontier, now held in consequence of the recent relief operations, should be evacuated as speedily as circumstances allow.

Nor is that all. Lord G. Hamilton now says that "the Radical papers" have "assumed" that he was responsible for the construction of the road. The assumption, one would think, was tolerably natural, seeing that Lord G. Hamilton had himself claimed credit for the road. Here is what he said in the House of Commons on February 17, 1896, in his speech in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment condemning the occupation of Chitral—an admirable amendment, which had the peculiar merit of giving the first place to the contention that the Government's policy "violated the pledge expressly given in the Viceroy's Proclamation":—

> The Government (said Lord George Hamilton in reply) *has succeeded in making an excellent road from Peshawar to Chitral*, and the tribes through whose territory it has passed have of their own accord undertaken to protect it. The result is that commerce has largely increased . . . The result of our occupation has been pre-eminently satisfactory . . . *The road has daily been improved*; it has been watched and guarded by local levies, who are paid; and trade is greatly increasing all along the route . . . Hon. gentlemen opposite appear not in the position of reformers, but of vandals. (Hear, hear.)

"I have kept silent," said the Secretary of State on Wednesday night, amid the approving laughter of the Chiswick Tories, "I like my opponents to commit themselves." But unfortunately he had *not* kept silent, and decent men of all parties will now require him to explain what is, on the face of it, a flat and most discreditable contradiction of himself.

Lord G. Hamilton forgets a good deal more than his own former speeches. When he talks about the breach of faith perpetrated by the Government of which he was a member, he forgets (1) that, at an early stage of the [illegible]ent war, one of the terms of peace proposed by the tribesmen was the evacuatio[illegible] of the Swat Valley; (2) that he was responsible for far more than the construction of a permanent road—namely, the occupation of Chitral, and the fortification of posts at Chakdara and the Malakand; and (3) that the pledges contained in the Viceroy's Proclamation were pledges, not merely to the tribes to whom they were addressed, but also to the taxpayers of India and to the public at home. The Proclamation amounted to a solemn undertaking, offered to all whom it might concern, that the Chitral Relief Expedition *was* a Relief Expedition and not another move in the disastrous and humiliating "Forward" game. Lord G. Hamilton now turns round upon the official chiefs of the Liberal party with reference to the Durand Mission, and threatens to lay the despatches before Parliament. All this ought to be a salutary lesson to the Liberal Front Bench. *They* ought to have produced the papers, just as *they* ought to have published the Chitral Blue-book, instead of leaving it to be edited and garbled by their successors, who are known to have omitted, among other things, Sir Donald Stewart's conclusive memorandum against the "Forward" policy. Lord G. Hamilton, like Mr. Curzon, confidently predicts that a motion relating to the war beyond the frontier will not be moved, when Parliament meets, "by any occupant of the Front Opposition Bench." So, too, the *Standard* wrote in its first leading article last Friday:—

> Nor do we imagine that the disposition to make trouble about the question of Indian frontier management will survive the first calm interchange of opinion between the two Front Benches of the House of Commons.

If these confident predictions should prove to be well-founded, so much the worse for the Front Opposition Bench. But we trust that they are not well-founded. Sir Henry Fowler, at any rate, has declared his intention of resisting the "forward" policy "however disguised." That is the root of the matter. All Lord G. Hamilton's and Mr. Balfour's and Mr. Curzon's talk about "essential routes and positions," and "not heedless annexation but pacific control," is merely the "forward" policy in disguise, or, as we have termed it, the policy of the occupation of Chitral squared and raised to the power of ten.

Lord George Hamilton spoke, not like a Secretary for India, but like a Chancellor of the Exchequer, upon the indescribably important question of the British contribution to the cost of the war beyond the Indian frontier. Here are his words, taken from the full report in Thursday's *Times*:—

> A strong feeling has been expressed on the part, I think, of every section of the community to help India financially, if necessary, in the great troubles she has had to suffer, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer publicly intimated some time ago that if India found she could not meet the exceptional strain imposed upon her the British Exchequer would come to her aid. We could not tell what the position of Indian finance would be until the close of the last calendar year, when the Indian Government telegraphed to me the satisfactory information that India had shown great power of recuperation, that the revenue was coming in well, that the frontier expenditure was much less than had been anticipated, that the Indian Government believed that they would without difficulty be able to meet all the disbursements during the present financial year, and that so far as the next financial year was concerned there was every prospect of a large and substantial surplus. I have not the slightest doubt that in those conditions it would be unwise to help India. It is much better to keep the two Exchequers as far apart as we can. If once the idea gets abroad that the Imperial Exchequer is behind the Indian Exchequer, the check on expenditure would be greatly vitiated if not lost.

We have neither time nor space to deal adequately with this precious declaration in our present issue. But let us say once more (1) that the real ground for an Imperial contribution to the cost of the present war is not the poverty of India, appalling though that is, but the fact that the war has been conceived and carried out in pursuit of Imperial policy; and (2) that the wishes of the *Government* of India are not in any degree a safer guide in this

matter than the wishes of the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself. What the *Government* (as distinguished from the taxpayers) of India sees in an Imperial contribution to military expenditure is not assistance nor reparation, but the dreaded form of an Imperial policeman.

A Central News telegram dated Calcutta, January 26, appeared in some of Thursday's newspapers as follows :—

The new Government Bill designed to repress seditious writings in the Indian Press is meeting with strong and remarkably general hostility.

The *Englishman*, the leading Anglo-Indian journal, which was at first a warm supporter of the Bill, has turned right round, and has even outdone the rest of the newspapers by publishing to-day a strongly-worded leading article on the subject.

"The forward policy," the *Englishman* declares, "persisted in despite every dissuasion, and culminating in disaster and ridicule, exhausted public patience, and neither Lord Salisbury nor Lord Elgin can afford another blunder, or overlook the cry that repressive and unnecessary legislation is being countenanced here." Considerable significance and importance is attached to this article.

In the same connexion we may cite a portion of the valuable letter which Sir William Markby (formerly a Judge of the High Court, Calcutta) wrote to last Saturday's *Spectator*, with reference to the proposal to empower Magistrates to dispose summarily of offences under Section 124A.

Two things must be borne in mind—first, that the Magistrate in India is also in reality one of the heads of the police; secondly, that the Magistrate in India represents the Government, and the native Press "the Opposition." The state of things proposed, therefore, would be paralleled here if Press offences could be dealt with by the heads of the police, and care were taken that the heads of the police should always be warm partisans of the Government. The picture drawn by Lord Elgin of officers of Government warmly welcoming the criticism of the Press is a purely imaginary one, if by criticism is meant strong and effective criticism, and unless he meant this his words have no meaning. The liberty of the Press means nothing unless it means freedom to use language which is strong and, if necessary, severe. But no Government and no political party ever really welcomes criticism of this kind. They can sometimes afford to despise it. But if they take it seriously they are sure to resent it. Even in the calmer walks of literature the magnanimity which welcomes criticism is very rare. The language of the Penal Code very easily lends itself to conviction except in the hands of a thoroughly impartial person.

Sir William Markby added that the appeal to the High Court "is, I fear, the only protection which the Press now has in India."

The proposed changes in the law of sedition in India continue to excite the liveliest apprehensions in the minds of sober, moderate and loyal journalists all over India. The *Hindu Patriot* of Calcutta, one of the most influential and loyal journals in India, writes: "If the object of the proposed legislation is to strike terror into the hearts of Indian journalists, then we can assure Government that that object has already been attained. We are now passing through a very critical time when coolness is wanted at the helm. But the action of Government has already caused something bordering on a panic in the native community."

The *Madras Standard* refers to the long struggle fought by Englishmen and by Indians side by side before they achieved liberty of the Press for India, and laments the fact that after so many decades that liberty is about to be lost.

In the past, both Englishmen and Indians have struggled together for the liberty of the Press when that liberty was wanting, mourned together when that liberty was curtailed or restricted, and rejoiced together when that liberty was restored. It was Lord Metcalfe who restored the liberty of the Press in India, and at a dinner held in his honour, Mr. Longueville Clarke, the chairman, in the course of a speech proposing the toast in honour of the Press, said: "I deny that we want an atmosphere of liberty of our own; but the liberty which is our birthright we would not part with and we would share it with our native fellow-subjects. (Loud Cheers.) In the present state of the country we do share with them the liberty of the Press, and this is the first contrast between our present and former state."

The *Indu-Prakash*, of Bombay, says with indisputable truth that the proposed innovations would unsettle the country and tend to create those very feelings among the populace which the Government desires to suppress. The *Advocate of India* (Bombay) adds that the proposed law would arm the magistrate with enormous powers to send her Majesty's subjects to gaol if their feelings of loyalty "do not come up to his standard of what is right and proper."

The Lahore *Tribune* considers that "the proposed extension of jurisdiction is dangerous." The Lucknow *Advocate* beseeches Lord Elgin "not to gag the mouth of the Press" by the proposed legislation. It is significant that journals conducted by Englishmen in India do not support the proposed measure. We quoted from the *Statesman*, of Calcutta, and the *Champion*, of Bombay, in our last issue. We find, also, that the *Pioneer* of Allahabad does not altogether support the proposed changes, and the *Times of India* sees no necessity for it.

The *Indian Daily News*, a Calcutta journal conducted by an Englishman, exposes in a vigorous article the [illegible] committed by the Member of Council who introduced the Bill. The *Morning Post*, also edited by an Englishman, has some remarks which deserve to be quoted :—

We hope the Government's proposal to throttle the Press [illegible] disclosed in our Calcutta correspondent's telegram to-day will be appreciated by those of our contemporaries who, with the Viceroy and his advisers, have lost their heads over the vagaries of a few of the native papers. If this fantastic so-called amendment of the law of sedition ever comes into force, it will be practically impossible to conduct a newspaper in India on anything approaching journalistic lines. We are face to face with what, in effect, is a Press Stifling Act, and we trust there will be a prompt and universal awakening to this very evident fact.

We fancy that there *is* "a prompt and universal awakening."

Indian feeling on the working and the manipulation of the law of sedition was strikingly manifested by the reception the Congress gave to the admirable speech of Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, who has been twice President. The terms of the motion submitted by Mr. Bonnerjee are worth recording and considering :—

That this Congress views with alarm and anxiety the changes proposed in the existing law of sedition which will deal an irreparable blow to liberty of speech and the freedom of the Press; and this Congress is of opinion that regard being had to the circumstances of the country, the law of sedition should be so amended as to bring within its provisions such articles and speeches only as instigate people not to render lawful obedience to the authority of Government or to resist the law by force, in accordance [illegible] views of Sir James Stephen. And further that no trial [illegible] by a Magistrate, but that all trials for sedition should be before [illegible]rt of Sessions or a High Court and by a Jury not less than [illegible] whom should be the countrymen of the accused. That a co[illegible] Resolution be submitted to the Legislative Council by the [illegible]

Mr. Bonnerjee most justly complained [illegible] a time of profound peace (as Sir Charles Farran [illegible] on the bench) and when the law had been for a second time laid down by the High Courts, the Government of India should at once wish to change it, "and change it in such a way as to show the utmost distrust of the people by putting them under the thumb of the police and making their lives and their liberties a by-word." No man in India, whether on or off the bench, is more fully qualified to express an opinion on this question; and no man's word will carry more weight with his countrymen than Mr. Bonnerjee's.

What Mr. Chalmers professes to desire is that the law of sedition should be made identical in India and in England. The proposition, put generally, is plausible enough, but it is wholly fallacious. Each country ought obviously to have legislation suited to its particular conditions. But Mr. Bonnerjee does not quarrel with the proposition in the present case. He deals with it on the same footing with Mr. Chalmers. But he takes care to point out that the mere text of a law is only one element in the business; the law does not lie solely in the letter of the statute, but also in the mode of administration. His argument is worthy of calm consideration at Calcutta and at Westminster :—

Mr. Chalmers thinks that the law of this country as regards sedition should be the same as the law of sedition as it exists in England. Well, for myself, I have no objection to that: let us have the English law of sedition, *but let us have the same machinery for the administration of this law as it is in England.* Why, in England these trials for sedition are before a judge who is a countryman of the prisoner, by a jury who are also the countrymen of the prisoner, and no trial can take place unless a true bill has been found by the Grand Jury, who are also countrymen of the prisoner. Here we have, so far as British Indian subjects are concerned, a trial by jury in a Presidency town, but that jury is or may be a jury entirely consisting of Europeans, and not one single one of them need know the language in which the seditious speech or article is supposed to have been written. Therefore, *it is no use giving us only one portion of the English law on the subject and not the other portion.*

Of course Mr. Bonnerjee ridicules the preposterous idea of the prevalence of sedition in India. But he is well aware that "our voice will go unheard in this country." [illegible] real appeal must be to the people of Great Britain.

ought to know "that we are being treated in this matter in a manner that is wholly unworthy of the British love of freedom." An outspoken protest like this, from a man of Mr. Bonnerjee's standing and character, would give pause to any Government that had not lost its head. We earnestly commend Mr. Bonnerjee's argument to the attention of the English Press.

The *Times of India* professes thankfulness for Mr. Bonnerjee's admission that under Mr. Justice Strachey's interpretation of the law of sedition people knew where they stood and were able to take care of themselves.

"This," says the *Times of India*, "is just the view that we have been strenuously advancing, and we should have been glad if the Government of India had recognized it, and had seen in the reiterated endorsements of the Bombay ruling a reason for leaving the section alone until the necessity for recasting it had been established."

So far good. But the *Times of India* is not entitled to suggest the implication that the law is satisfactory. People may understand where they are, and yet be very much dissatisfied with the situation. What Mr. Bonnerjee means, of course, is that however unfortunate the position was before, it is now to be rendered practically intolerable. The *Times of India* appears to think so, too.

The Congress treatment of the Natu case is also deserving of particular notice in England, for it has sent a thrill of indignant amazement through Indian society. Even the *Englishman* has acknowledged that a wave of unrest is passing through the length and breadth of the country. The brothers Natu are said to be detained "for reasons of State." What are these reasons of State? What answer is there, or can there be, to the Hon. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea's argument?

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Government possessed the right to enact the Regulations, what he had to consider was whether it was justified in arresting and detaining the Natu brothers. . . . . On the occasion of the Budget Debate, Lord George Hamilton gave out that there was a plot in India to subvert British rule, among the Poona Brahmins, and it was suggested that the arrest of the Natu brothers might lead to the unveiling of this plot and conspiracy. *Who were the conspirators, and what was the object of this conspiracy? Was there any evidence for this plot? There was absolutely none.* On the contrary, what evidence there was completely demolished the theory of the Secretary of State. What did Chapekar, to whose confessions the dignity of official recognition had been extended, say about this conspiracy? Who were the conspirators? Himself and his worthy brother. *If they accepted his statements, it must be said, the Congress should say it, and he would say it on their behalf, that it absolutely absolved the Poona Brahmins of all complicity.* Upon evidence which would not justify the hanging of a cat or a dog, Lord George Hamilton brought this great charge against a community which in the past had played an important part in the history of this country and which still constituted the intellectual aristocracy of the Western Presidency, barring of course the enlightened community of Parsees.

Plainly, therefore, as the resolution puts it, "it is the duty of the Government, in the interests of justice, and also to allay the disquiet and uneasiness which has been created in the minds of the people at large by the arrest, to bring them—the brothers Natu—to trial without delay; or, if the Government have not sufficient evidence against them to place before a Court of Justice, to release them." The revival of the antiquated Bombay Regulation XXV. of 1827, in a time of "profound peace," is universally and most justly regarded as abhorrent to the principles of English justice and English government.

What is this that we read in our *St. James's* (leading article, January 26)? Let us capture it at once, and set it down in solid brevier:—

We know what to suspect concerning the deeds of those who fear the light.

Is the *Pioneer*, then, wounded in the house of its friend—the *Pioneer* with its nervous dread of Parliamentary discussion? Perish the thought! No; the *St. James's Gazette*, it seems, is referring to the London County Council. But its observation, which is unexceptionable, is general in its terms, and what is sauce for the County Council (though the remark is, of course, quite uncalled-for with reference to that admirable body) is sauce for the *Pioneer* and the section of Anglo-Indians whom the *Pioneer* represents.

We have the pleasure to announce that we have now appointed "authorised correspondents" in Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras, for the despatch of telegrams to this journal at press rates. This arrangement was, of course, impossible until INDIA became a weekly journal, as one of the conditions of registration as a newspaper is publication at intervals not longer than seven days. Instructions have been forwarded by to-day's mail to a large number of correspondents throughout India, and they will send to the "authorised correspondent" who, in each case, is nearest to their district news which it is desired to telegraph to us. It may be well, however, to call attention here to the following extract from the "conditions" regarding telegrams, as stated in the circular of the Eastern Telegraph Company:—

Messages can only be accepted from the *authorised correspondent* of a newspaper, and the news sent in such messages must be duly published in the newspaper, or satisfactory reasons be given for non-publication, in the absence of which full rates will be chargeable.

We hope that the regular receipt of telegraphic news from responsible non-official correspondents in India will usefully supplement the telegrams — almost invariably from official Anglo-Indian circles—which at present appear in British newspapers. Arrangements, we may add, have also been made by which wide publicity will be secured for our telegrams in different parts of the United Kingdom.

In this connexion reference may be made to a telegram, "from native correspondents" at Madras, which was printed in the *Daily Chronicle* of Monday last. The telegram, which was dated "Madras, Saturday," was as follows:—

A joint public meeting of Hindus and Mahometans was held here yesterday to protest against the sedition law amendments. Resolutions were carried praying that the offence should be made triable by a jury, half of whom should be countrymen of the accused, and condemning the provision empowering postal authorities to open, detain, and destroy suspected newspapers and books.

The Indian Government's action against the Indian Press was condemned as retrograde, and opposed to British principles.

To this telegram the following editorial note was added:—

We have made arrangements for the communication from time to time from native sources of items of news affecting the interests of the people of India. In view of the grave questions arising in which the natives are interested, we have felt this step to be one of importance. We do not make ourselves responsible for all the statements of our correspondents, but we have taken p... that t...

We need ...
part of the D...
not be too wid...

Correspond...
time to time ...
papers articl...
have explain...
undertake; ...
articles and le...
accepted by En...
by the writers. ...
that method sav...
being fresh. T...
English sponsorsh...
is remarkable, and o...
We have no reason to be...
great morning journals, on...
like the *Times*, the *Standar*...
Telegraph, the *Daily News*, ...
chester Guardian and the *L*...
reluctant to consider on the...
from India. At any rate, the ...
is to make fair trial of them, and ...
burden of refusal. But perhaps some of our co... will forgive us if, while we must decline to become godfather to their offspring, we presume to give them a word or two of friendly advice. If so, we would suggest: (1) that editors are probably reluctant to pledge themselves in advance to allot a stated space once a week to a particular subject, especially for "copy" which they have not had the advantage of seeing; (2) that, therefore, an individual article is in an imperfect world more hopeful than a series, and infinitely more hopeful than an offer to write a series; (3) that arguments are, as a rule, more acceptable than statements, and proofs than allegations; and (4) that an article *is* an article, and not, for example, a history of the world from the earliest times to the present day. Indian correspondents who submit "copy" to English journals will, we fancy, lose nothing by being very concise, very much to the point, very careful, very prompt—and all these things not too often. It is easy, and even helpful, sometimes to refrain from writing.

MORALITY IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS.[1]

PRACTICAL men at the present day are little more inclined than they were in Plato's time to adopt his famous paradox, that "Un[illegible]l either philosophers obtain the kingly power, or those who are now called kings and potentates become imbued with an adequate measure of genuine philosophy, there will be no deliverance for cities, nor, I believe, for the human race." But all who have given earnest thought to moral questions must have felt that there is one important service which the philosopher from time to time can render to the practical man. Our moral practice rests upon, or follows, a certain body of accepted moral principles. The moral progress of the world depends upon two things—upon the fuller performance of principles already accepted, and upon the gradual advancement of our moral principles themselves. But two forces are always tending in practice to militate against these two kinds of progress. We make, under stress of circumstances, all kinds of exceptions and reservations to principles that we admit to be generally true and right, and these exceptions, in their turn, weaken the hold of the general principle and replace it by another less difficult and noble. Thus we not only tend to perform less strenuously what we know we ought to perform, but our knowledge of our duty, and of duty in general, becomes itself imperfect and confused.

It is in this connexion that the philosopher renders the world an inestimable service. For it is his function not merely to set forth general principles, from which we may deduce practical rules, but, beginning at the other end, to systematize for us our practice and show what principles that practice really implies. If such a service has its own dangers—if for clever and unmoralized youth, for instance, there is no keener delight than the discovery that principles hitherto held to be moral have for some time been abandoned in practice and may henceforth be ridiculed as worn-out superstitions—yet on all tolerably thoughtful and earnest men the effect is likely to be wholesome; nothing [illegible]akening to consciousness of the [illegible]

[illegible]ust be

[illegible]ndividuals,

[illegible]ien also. "Not

[illegible]umble degree,

[illegible] have also our

[illegible]ental responsi-

[illegible]e professional

[illegible]vernment.

[illegible]nce of the task

[illegible]ys on "Public

[illegible]contained in his

[illegible]ssay on "Public

[illegible]iere is any funda-

[illegible] private morality.

[illegible]ot subject in their

[illegible]entary rules of private

[illegible]usly maintained that it is

[illegible] it can properly be called

[illegible] persons duly instructed in

[illegible]olitical thought." He begins

[illegible]proposition goes a good deal

[illegible]ropositions that may at first

[illegible] it. It does not simply affirm

[illegible]o be judged more leniently than

[illegible] the greatness of his temptation or

[illegible] nobleness of his patriotic motive, or (2) that there is an esoteric, professional morality amongst politicians, which allows considerable relaxation of ordinary rules of justice, veracity, etc., or (3) that breaches of morality, if successful, are apt to be condoned by the nation that profits by them. "The point is that the approval of such breaches is formulated in explicit general maxims, raised into a system, and deliberately applied by eminent students of history and political science to the acts of statesmen in remote ages and countries." That this is no exaggeration is shown by the sentences quoted by Mr. Sidgwick from Rümelin, Chancellor of the University of Tübingen. "The State is self-sufficient . . . . The maintenance and development of its own power and well-being—egoism, if you like to call this egoism—is the supreme principle of all politics. . . . . The maintenance of the State justifies every sacrifice, and is superior to every moral rule."

If the theory remained the property of historians the matter would be less serious. But, as Lord Acton said in the concluding sentence of his Inaugural Lecture, "If we lower our standard in history, we cannot uphold it in Church or State." There can be little doubt that the doctrine has leavened more or less unconsciously the judgments of ordinary men, and that it has passed from Germany to England. This result has been largely due to the influence of Carlyle and Mommsen. It is true that Carlyle indignantly denied having taught that "Might is Right"; but his doctrine is often very difficult to distinguish from this, and has been confused with it by admirers as well as by enemies. Splendid as his influence has been in many ways, in this direction it has been positively harmful. The authority of Mommsen, the brilliant historian of Rome and apologist of Cæsar, has operated in the same direction, and it is a factor not to be left out of account. The late Mr. E. A. Freeman, reviewing the history when it was first translated into English, and expressing the fullest admiration of its merits, anxiously forecasted its moral influence; and his prediction has been abundantly verified. Mommsen's conception of the great man pursuing his destined way to colossal achievement, and untroubled by the rules made for the observance of lesser men, is a peculiarly fascinating one. Small wonder if it has caught the fancy of more than one generation of sixth-form boys and undergraduates. Stripped of the halo with which the worship of the great man has invested it, and looked at in all its nakedness, the doctrine is repulsive enough. But it is the doctrine which is at the bottom of German Imperial policy, which was really adopted in England by the late Lord Beaconsfield (though perhaps only explicitly avowed by his faithful admirer, Mr. Frederick Greenwood), and which is implied in the "Forward Policy" in India and Africa at the present moment. Mr. Sidgwick's criticism, therefore, is no less opportune than forcible:

> It neither appeals to the common moral consciousness of mankind, which, indeed, it [illegible] to override, nor to any principles which have ever been accepted by philosophers. For egoism pure and simple, the doctrine that each individual's interest must be to him ultimately paramount to all other considerations, there is, in abstract ethical discussion, much to be said; but I have never seen, nor can I conceive, any ethical reasoning that will provide even a plausible basis for the compound proposition that a man is bound to sacrifice his private interest to that of the human beings constituting his state, but that neither he nor they are under any similar obligation to the rest of mankind. . . . . I do not think that the history of polity and of political ideas gives us any reason for believing that this emancipation from morality, if once admitted, will stop where the Neo-Machiavellians desire it to stop—at national egoism. . . . This Neo-Machiavellian doctrine is really condemned by history—the Cæsar to which it appeals—no less than by the old-fashioned moral philosophy that it despises.

Mr. Sidgwick's conclusion is that there is no fundamental difference between public and private morality, but that, just as "ideal conduct," in Mr. Herbert Spencer's words, "is not possible for the ideal man in the midst of men otherwise constituted," so for the State, ideal morality implies a certain reciprocal fulfilment of duty on the part of other States. If the foreign State does not recognise such duties, our virtuous State must be allowed "to anticipate attack which it has reasonable grounds for regarding as imminent, to meet wiles with wiles as well as force with force, and to be circumspect in the fulfilment of any compact it may make with such a State." But both with regard to individuals and to States it must be insisted that the interest of the part is to be pursued only in such manner and degree as is compatible with the interests of the whole—*i.e.* of humanity.

In the second essay, on "The Morality of Strife," Mr. Sidgwick gives reasons for taking a despondent view as to the possibility of superseding war by arbitration, and asks whether morality can suggest any other method for reducing the number of wars. The weakness of arbitration lies in its purely external character: "the disputants are almost inevitably left to concentrate their attention on their own one-sided views, and—if I may so say—harden themselves in their one-sidedness, because their function in the process of settlement is to advocate their own case before the outside arbiter; they are not supposed to be convinced by his decision, but merely to accept it for the sake of peace." There are also numerous practical objections, such as the difficulty of finding a really impartial arbiter. The only sure ground of reconciliation is in

[1] "Practical Ethics."—A Collection of Addresses and Essays. By Henry Sidgwick, Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co.

opponents learning to understand each other's point of view. The aim of morality should be to reduce the causes of war by "cultivating a spirit of justice." "There is hardly any plain duty of great importance in which civilised men fail so palpably as in this." Mr. Sidgwick refers to the jealousies that have been, and are likely to be, caused by the expansion of civilised States amongst barbarian neighbours in Asia and Africa. Moral opinion, he thinks, should set itself steadily against the extension of a nation's right of self-defence to justify hostile interference to prevent a neighbour growing strong merely through expansion or coalescence with other States. But he only treats of the question as between civilised nations, and does not consider the further and equally difficult question of the rights of the uncivilised.

The remaining essays of the volume—"Luxury," "The Pursuit of Culture," "Religious Conformity," are some of the subjects—lie beyond the scope of the present article. The whole book is remarkable for a clearness of thought and of expression seldom attained in philosophical discussion. The brief abstract here given will be sufficient to show that the essays may be read with profit by others than professed students of philosophy. Indeed, their real importance lies in the fact that Mr. Sidgwick, like his master Socrates, has "brought philosophy down from heaven to earth."

THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FAILURE OF THE TIRAH EXPEDITION.

By Colonel H. B. Hanna.

THERE are already signs that an attempt will shortly be made both in Parliament and in the Press to throw the blame of the failure of the late military operations against the Afridis upon the officers conducting them. Could their incompetency be established it would be allowable for the champions of the Forward Policy to argue that the Indian Government, if better served, would have had something solid, if not brilliant, to show for their vast expenditure of money, transport and human life, and to claim for that policy one more chance of vindicating its expiring credit.

Fortunately for the future of India, it is impossible to prove such incompetency as would justify public opinion in acquiescing in any shifting of responsibility from the authorities at Simla to their subordinates in Tirah, though in saying this, I must not be supposed to assert that no mistakes were made by the latter, nor yet to defend the Indian Government's selection of officers for high command in so critical an enterprise, with the sole exception of General Lockhart, who was marked out by experience and ability for the post he was recalled from Europe to fill—but simply to maintain the opinion that that enterprise carried in itself, from the beginning, the seeds of disaster.

The Tirah expedition was bound to fail, firstly, because adequate transport, by which I mean transport of the right quality as well as of the proper amount, was no longer procurable—the best material of all kinds having already been used up.

It was bound to fail, secondly, because the great delay in bringing together such transport as was finally obtained, was unavoidable,—all the nearer collecting grounds having been exhausted.

It was bound to fail, thirdly, because those delays threw its advance so late in the year as to multiply the hardships to be endured and the difficulties to be overcome, and to narrow to a dangerous degree the time limits within which, day by day, the movements of its different component parts could be executed.

It was bound to fail, fourthly, because the country to be invaded was so inaccessible, and the accidents to which the troops were exposed were so numerous and varied, that it must often have been impossible for any officer, however far-sighted and energetic to foretell, with anything like accuracy, at what hour he would reach any given point. Much indignation has been expressed at the disasters which on several occasions overtook the rear-guard of our columns; but disasters to rear-guards have always been the common-places of mountain warfare. It is easy to say that this general or that ought not to have permitted his troops to be benighted—that he should have started earlier, or pushed on faster; but it is as dangerous to start in the dark as to arrive in the dark, and when a commander has to use one half his force to protect the other half by crowning lofty mountains of the most rugged nature, to talk of pushing on faster is to be guilty of no little presumption.

The Tirah Expedition was bound to fail, fifthly, because its enemies were brave men, numerous, well armed, vigilant, burning with rage and resentment, and fighting under conditions as favourable to them as they were unfavourable to us.

Now of these five causes of failure not one would have been removed or softened though every officer, from Lockhart himself down to the youngest subaltern, had been exchanged for some one else. Weighed against these causes, the blunders and short-comings of individuals had no appreciable influence on the result of the campaign; and as one and all were involved in the nature of the undertaking, or the conditions under which it had to be carried out, the responsibility for its failure rests exclusively with those who *willed* it—the British and Indian Governments—and those who *planned* it—the Commander-in-Chief in India and his Staff. And not only must they be held answerable for that failure—theirs is the fault that it was attended by such terrible suffering and serious loss of life, for, as I pointed out weeks ago in a letter to the *Morning Post*, an experienced soldier like Sir William Lockhart would not have lingered in Tirah till winter had set in if he had been free to act upon his own judgment—an opinion since fully confirmed by the special correspondent of the *Times*; and I shall be very much surprised if it does not prove that his line of retirement from Maidan was imposed upon him from Simla by men who had no scruple about sacrificing military prudence to a miserable political vanity, which sought to cover the reality of defeat under a semblance of power too exalted to recognise any limits that man or nature could set to the realisation of their schemes.

MR. CROOKE ON THE N.-W. PROVINCES.[1]

By Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E.

Late officiating Commissioner of Orissa; Sometime Member of the Bengal Legislative Council.

MR. CROOKE'S work on the North-Western Provinces of India is a welcome contribution to our knowledge of the people of those Provinces, their religious and social life, their past history under Hindu and Mussulman rule, and their condition under British rule. The author writes with the mature knowledge of an administrator who has passed the best years of his life among the people of India, who has tried to acquaint himself with their past history, and who has no theories to prove, but desires to paint them as they are.

The Vedic Hymns, composed before 1400 B.C., "[illegible]-re-sent the Aryas as having attained a high grade [illegible] tion. They had acquired a knowledge [illegible] handicrafts, and though many of them [illegible] living on the produce of their flocks and her[illegible] already occupied the land, were engaged in the [illegible] of the soil, and had founded villages and towns." [illegible] was "between the fourteenth and the fifth cen[illegible] before Christ, the period extending from the era of th[illegible] composition of the Vedas to the construction of the law code, which we know as the Institutes of Manu, the present Hindu polity was established."

The writer has something to say of the rise of Buddhism and the edicts of Asoka, and of the long centuries during which believers in Buddhism and in Brahminism were "living together on fairly amicable terms." On this point we may refer our readers to a paper recently read by Professor Rhys Davids in the rooms of the Royal Asiatic Society. The Professor maintained, and Dr. Bühler agreed with him, that an examination of the literary and other evidence now extant does not reveal any real religious persecution in India such as was witnessed in Europe even in recent centuries.

In tracing the history of the Mussulman rulers of India the author devotes much space to personal incidents which pass for history, and does not sufficiently deal with the condition of the people. "In spite of the prevailing disorder," he rightly observes in one place, "there was a

[1] "The North Western Provinces of India," by W. Crooke, Bengal Civil Service (Retired.) Methuen and Co. 1897.

considerable amount of prosperity" in the country. We should like to see some historian of the Mussulman period take up this point and give us a picture of the people who lived quietly and obscurely in village communities or under local chiefs and zemindars, carried on their internal trade by means of primitive boats and primitive bullock carts, attended to agriculture, and produced those cotton fabrics which were the wonder of the Western world. An account of the real condition of the people of India from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century has yet to be written. The author writes with some disappointment that "short of holding the wretched villagers in the neighbourhood of the main lines of communication responsible for loss of life and property, there was no efficient police." But one feels doubtful whether the District Police which has been organised under the present rule is really more efficient than the local arrangements of the "wretched villagers," and one would like to know something more of the system of complete and fairly efficient if rude self-government under which villagers managed their own concerns, guarded their fields and huts, grew their crops and plied their looms, be the occupier of the throne Afghan or Mogul, Persian or Tartar. The history of the crimes of the palace and the wars of its occupants has often been written; the history of the people of India between the thirteenth and eighteenth centuries has not yet been written.

The greater part of Mr. Crooke's book is taken up with an account of the country under British rule, and his remarks about famines are interesting at the present moment, when India is recovering from a severe visitation of this kind. Of the earlier famines which occasionally visited the country during the six centuries of Mussulman rule, Mr. Crooke cites only two instances (excluding epidemics and wars), and they were the famines of 1291 and 1327. But from the commencement of the conquests of the East India Company the record of famines is fuller and more frequent. There were famines in 1770, in 1783, and in 1803, and "in fact these early years of our rule seem to have been marked by an unusual amount of scarcity to which excessive revenue assessments" and other causes contributed.

This is sad, but what is still more sad is that after a century of British rule the country is faring no better, and one of the causes which contributed to the early famines, viz., excessive revenue assessments, still continues in full operation. Mr. Crooke does not tell us so, but the conviction is growing in the minds of many thoughtful enquirers that the fiscal demands of the present administration are excessive, and leave nothing to the people to fall back upon in years of bad harvest. There were famines in the North-Western Provinces in 1837, in 1860, in 1868, in 1874, in 1877, and in 1897. The increase in population is not the true reason for these [illegible] visitations, and Mr. Crooke very rightly asserts [illegible] increase of the population does not progress at [illegible] as is commonly supposed, and that [illegible]s and prudential considerations do exercise [illegible] on the fertility of the people." Elsewhere the [illegible] maintains that "statistics do not bear out the [illegible]usion that the rate of increase is excessive, or even up [illegible] the European standard." That being so, the problem of frequent famines remains unexplained unless we have the courage to admit our blunder and honestly recognize the fact that our assessment of the land is excessive, and is grinding down a frugal and sober and industrious population in a most fertile country into a state verging on chronic poverty.

The last chapter of Mr. Crooke's work is on land and its settlement, and if he had not been somewhat misled by official prejudices he might have discovered in this the true explanation of the poverty of the cultivators of India outside Bengal. Bengal is permanently settled, and Bengal has been singularly free from famines during this century. And we are convinced that a similar settlement, extended to the other provinces of India, would bring protection and relief to the cultivators, and secure to them a margin of profit arising out of future extension in cultivation and rise in prices. Mr. Crooke says that "the opinion of all competent authorities is decidedly opposed to its extension to Northern India; that under its operation Bengal pays much less than its due proportion of the public burdens." We demur to both these statements. We have had experience of revenue administration in Bengal during a quarter of a century, and have known many administrators of larger experience and higher authority; and we do not admit the correctness of the statement either that all competent authorities are against the extension of the Permanent Settlement to other Provinces, or that Bengal pays less than its share to the Imperial exchequer. What we do admit is that land is more moderately assessed in Bengal than elsewhere where settlements are frequent, and where at each settlement between fifty and sixty-five per cent. of the rental is demanded by the State. What we maintain is that this enormous tax on land is not consistent with the well-being of the people, and that until the State demand from the soil is permanently fixed in the other Provinces, the condition of the peasantry cannot improve with the extension of cultivation and the rise of prices, and famines will continue to afflict the peasantry in years of bad harvest.

For the rest, we commend this book both to English and to Indian readers as an interesting account of an important Province of India by an administrator of mature experience, who writes with true and commendable sympathy for the people for whom and amidst whom he has worked for many years of his life.

SITTING ON THE SAFETY-VALVE.

It was only some three years ago that the late Sir George Chesney was not ashamed to abuse the just authority of his name by lending it to the support of the stock Anglo-Indian accusations against the native Press, and pointing the sting of the preposterous allegations with all the vigour of hearty good will. On that occasion, it may be remembered, Sir Richard Garth, late Chief Justice of Bengal, nobly and to his lasting honour came forward, with all the authority of mature judicial experience, in defence of the inculpated Press. The main points of Sir Richard's chivalrous championship we placed before our readers at the time, and we have taken subsequent opportunities to recall them. Under the existing circumstances, however, they will bear—they even require—repetition. Sir Richard Garth wrote:—

> I can only say I read native papers myself week after week, and never see anything there at all approaching sedition or even disloyalty or disrespect to English rule. What I do find there, and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many of the Government officials. *I am afraid this is exactly what the Government would wish to repress.* I consider it a most wholesome and salutary means of bringing the misconduct of Government officers to the notice not only of the Indian people but of the Courts of Justice.

In that article Sir Richard's main object was to challenge the ridiculous and virulent invectives that were being hurled by disgusted officialism against the loyalty of the Indian National Congress. This subject naturally led him on to specify certain of the more outstanding causes of the discontent which gave rise to the criticisms so obnoxious to the official mind. It would be vastly more to the purpose of the Government to put its energies into a serious reformation of these exciting causes than to expend itself upon a miserable persecution of unnoticed and unnoticeable local sheets, a crusade which can only bring it to discredit and ridicule, stir up fresh sources of gratuitous trouble, and fizzle out in utter futility on the main issue.

If the Government is still in the dark as to these causes, it cannot have dissipated much of its time and attention in the perusal of these columns. We have dealt faithfully with it, not by mere expression of opinion, but by careful marshalling of facts and inference—we hope with scrupulous fairness. Now, why is it that we witness a painful recrudescence of violent hostility to the Press? We say the Press—the Press at large; for the new-fangled clauses in amendment of the Penal Code class every newspaper proprietor, editor, and printer in India with the most wretched budmashes that terrorize lonely villages in out-of-the-way districts. Of course, the editorial sycophants of officialism will not mind being declassed in an obscure clause of a statute which will never ruffle a feather of their plumage in stern fact. The practical result is that the Government proposes to hold the terrors of a vague and elastic power over the independent Press of the country, European as well as native. Hitherto, and probably in the future, the European editor has been and will be moderately safe. It is the native Press that will bear the real

brunt of official displeasure. It is members of the native Press, naturally, that have fallen the first victims. There have been nearly a dozen cases in the present campaign, in which one now seems to discern a certain lull. But what is it that has prompted this exhibition of activity on the part of the Government? Well, it has all been displayed since the ill-advised prosecution of Mr. Tilak; since the unhappy chance of the deplorable murder of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst. Unquestionably the Government fancied that the untoward events of that period were directly traceable to the instigation of newspaper comments. Anglo-Indian wrath flamed out against native newspapers, and many of our unthinking and ignorant journalists at home caught fire in like manner and rained their hottest invectives on the ungrateful and treacherous Babu. The cause of all this misdirected and futile fury may be expressed in a single word; and that word is Panic. But, it may be said, why should the powerful Government of India give way to panic? Why, simply because it is out of touch with Indian feeling and thought, as Sir William Wedderburn pointed out in these columns the other day, and because it is therefore unable to resist the undiscriminating and equally ignorant pressure of Anglo-Indians who vaguely dread that after all they may be living on a smouldering volcano. The one word is Panic—unreasoning, ignorant, contemptible Panic.

Now this Panic is a subtle thing. It is a moral influenza. It may invade even the serene mind of a judge. Would the Sessions Judge of Satara have sentenced—in the face of his assessors' opinion too—the editor and the proprietor of the obscure *Pratoda* to transportation for life and seven years' imprisonment respectively, had he not been caught by the prevalent distemper? If not, what has the Government to say to the High Court's reduction of the sentences, on appeal, to one year's and three months' imprisonment? But for temporary mental affliction, would this Islampur print, publishing 225 copies a week, 50 of them gratis, with a total annual return of Rs. 150, or Rs. 3 per week—would this unknown print, we ask, have been prosecuted in August for an alleged seditious article printed in May? Certainly not. The wretched men were prosecuted simply because officialism lost what head it had to lose. The Chief Justice, sitting in the calm atmosphere of the law in Bombay, remarked on the appeal that it was "a period when profound peace dwells in the land." Take the *Vaibhav* case. The incriminated article was published in April, but proceedings were not taken against the paper till the end of July. The whole business has too plainly been the unhappy outcome of an afterthought, generated by misapprehension of the facts. It is to the last degree deplorable and humiliating. Look through the cases. The papers arraigned have been of the most insignificant character and importance: witness the foregoing statistics of the *Pratoda's* scale of operations. The only possible effect of their diatribes would have been to raise a passing smile on a few faces; any serious disturbance to Government or to anybody else is ridiculously out of the question—that is, unless one stands within the magic circle of Panic. What happens? These scribes have been manufacturing a little thunder, sometimes, it is said, with European inspiration. They have rumbled away in the same fashion before, and no notice was taken of them. Suddenly comes the bolt from the official blue. Then the poor victims plump down on their knees, and apologise humbly. And the majesty of Government is not ashamed—except in one or two cases—to crack the midget nut with the Nasmith hammer of the Law. Henceforth let us make a noteworthy exception to the maxim: *De minimis non curat lex.*

For ourselves, we have, and have always had, nothing but condemnation for all such acts as can with reason be brought under the designation of "disaffection," or disloyalty. We sympathise fully with a recent President of the Congress who impressively warned such agitators and newspapers as "have not fully realised the distinction between licence and liberty, and have not wholly grasped the lesson that freedom has its responsibilities no less than its privileges." But it is precisely for this reason that one cannot but reprobate the arbitrary swoop of officialism upon obscure journalists under the goading of an excited fancy that "something must be done," without any certainty that it is the right thing, and that too "at a period when profound peace dwells in the land." Besides, one cannot but lament a severity which forgets that, as Chief Justice Farran said, "the law as it exists on the subject of creating disaffection has been so long left in abeyance that its true purport may possibly not have been realised by the accused." It was not fully realised by the judges themselves. It is clear that the authorities in India have now to make allowances for the inevitable effects of Western ideas, and for this a rough-and-ready system of repression will not be found to answer. In the *Vaibhav* case the oppressive character of the plague measures as carried out at Poona was specifically appealed to by way of justification or palliation. In the *Moda Vritta* case the accused urged that "the Bombay daily papers were the real sedition-mongers, as they wrote things which aroused the native papers and led them to write as they did." In the *Jami-ul-Ulum* appeal from Moradabad, Mr. Justice Ranade himself said in his judgment that the incriminated "article appears to be the outcome of a general sense of vague dissatisfaction with the existing political arrangements." Now, we leave these various points as they stand, commending them very earnestly to the dispassionate consideration of the Government. Men do not show their teeth out of mere devilry. In any case British rule in India has come to stay, and Anglo-Indians had better take the plain and obvious methods which dispense with a state of siege. The very worst possible situation for the Government is to set itself down deliberately upon the safety-valve.

THE SOCIAL CONFERENCE.

According to the usual order of procedure, the Indian Social Conference met at Amraoti at the end of last month immediately after the close of the business of the Congress. It met in the Congress pandal. Happily there was not a word of protest against the place of assembly. Not that the point is of the smallest essential importance; yet in view of recent difficulties one is particularly gratified to learn that the harmony of the occasion was not disturbed by the revival of an irrelevant dispute, which, it is to be hoped, is now dead and buried. The attendance might have been larger. Though no doubt there is always pressure upon the time that visitors are able to allow themselves, yet it is plain that large numbers are needed to give the movement an impetus in the eye of the public. The real advance, of course, must always proceed silently, upon individual influences in private spheres. At the same time, the uses of a large demonstration are not to be ignored by way of supplementary aid. A striking feature of the meeting was the presence of a considerable number of ladies, some of whom, as Mr. Justice Ranade recognised, took "a very active and intelligent part in the debate of those subjects in which they thought their interests were concerned." Three Brahmin ladies in particular, we observe, delivered most sensible and pointed spee[illegible] in the discussion of resolutions deeply affecting won[illegible] example set by these ladies cannot but prove effective, and it opens up a vista of great hope for the future. After Mr. Justice Ranade's general survey, which we notice elsewhere, Mr. Vaman Madhav Kolhatkar, who has taken a prominent part in the movement in Berar, opened the proceedings from the chair with a presidential address of marked discretion and large breadth of view. He was able to point to continuous progress in the past, and to augur favourably of the immediate future. Yet he could not but acknowledge that there is still a paucity of workers in the field—a point that might well be put from the other side, however; for, in all the circumstances of Indian society, the really remarkable thing is that there should be any workers at all. He did admirable service, too, in pressing the fact that there is no real conflict between the aims of the reformers and the true interpretation of the Shastras. The acutely painful element in the social movement lies in this, that the reformer's keenest enemies are those of his own household and his own social circle. But time and education work together to smooth his path, and his courage may well derive strength from the support of a good conscience and the approval of all people of good sense and of experience.

The position of women naturally occupied the attention of the Conference in various important aspects. Mr. Mahajani, an educational inspector at Amraoti, appropriately laid his axe to the root of the tree in proposing a resolution in favour of the further spread of women's education, and the elevation of its standard. So long as women are left in the trammels of tradition, which has so

strangely warped the real teaching of the sagas, it is impossible for them not to continue to be drags upon the intelligent aspirations of their educated fathers and husbands and brothers. The distinct disparity between the education of boys and the education of girls in all parts of the country calls urgently for reduction, as a step to removal altogether. Mrs. Tulsi Bhai, an educated Brahmin lady, courageously enforced the terms of Mr. Mahajani's resolution from her own experience, and from her study of the history of the Hindu education of women in a past that has been forgotten or overlaid by a perverted practice in later times. It does seem odd to the Western mind that anyone should think it necessary to contend in these days that education is not really a bad thing for women. The practical means recommended by the Conference is the larger employment of qualified teachers trained in special normal schools established for the purpose in each Province, by the continuance of the school education in private houses by means of home classes on the plan followed in Poona, Mysore, and other places, and by taking steps to secure a body of Indian Sisters of Charity. The resolution on early marriages strikes in the same direction. It is not only that early marriage saps the physical and intellectual vigour of the people, but, as Mr. Subramania Iyer forcibly argued, it obstructs the development of the intellectual faculties of women, makes their education practically impossible, unfits them for the due discharge of the responsible and onerous duties of mothers, and in effect turns their homes into prisons, cutting them off from the interests and experience of the world. Very important also is the resolution on unequal marriages. It is, to put it gently, repugnant to natural feeling that men of more than fifty years of age should marry girls under twelve. It is also directly in the teeth of the Shastras. It is extremely prejudicial to the interests of the community. It might easily be avoided by adoption. The Conference cannot be charged with extravagance when it affirms the necessity of actively discouraging all marriages where the difference of age exceeds thirty years. On the question of the re-marriage of widows, it is plain that the time is near when the Widow Marriage Act of 1856 might be usefully strengthened in the way of providing more effective protection to the rights of widows. The Conference points out four specific points on which the law in its present state has failed to secure to widows the reasonable enjoyment of their rights, all of them important, and all of them operating so as to be amazingly harsh to the victim. There is also obvious reason in the complaint that the law provides no protection to a widow or an unmarried girl above 12 and below 16 who may consent to an act of personal dishonour at the hands of strangers. The age of consent ought to be [illegible]ed without further delay. The very ignorance [illegible] forms a powerful argument, if any argument wer[illegible]ally needed.

The progress of Western civilisation, we fear, is at least partly responsible for the necessity of a resolution in support of the cause of temperance, embodying a demand for some provision in the nature of Local Option. If temperance is important in societies located in humid and cold regions of the earth, how much more urgent must it be in the torrid clime of India? All activity in this direction, not fanatically led, will gain large sympathy from England, where the evils to be overcome are much better understood than in the case of many of the other points of the Conference programme. In England the restitution of conjugal rights has been transformed into a pecuniary accommodation. But in India, some of us will be surprised to learn, women may be imprisoned by way of execution of decrees for restitution. The legislature, which has already abolished imprisonment of women for judgment debts, might usefully turn its favourable attention to this matter. The poverty of the country has raised into unusual prominence the question of the regulation of charity, so as to prevent its becoming an incentive to idleness and pauperism. There seems to be some danger lest "temples and choultries, originally built with beneficent motives, should be gradually degraded to the level of asylums for loafers and vagabonds." The general restoration of national prosperity might find a motive here. Connected with this subject is the long agitated question of religious endowments. This would undoubtedly be brought into a healthier position by the passing of the Hon. Mr. Ananda Charlu's Bill, which proposes, without any violent disturbance of existing arrangements, to subject the trustees of a shrine to the effective moral control of a Temple Board, consisting of respectable worshippers in the neighbourhood. The accounts must certainly be open to public scrutiny. Several resolutions tend to breaking down absurd restrictions of caste, most hurtful in their social influence. The evils of the Hindu joint family system would be mitigated in some not unimportant degree by the Hon. Mr. Bashyam Iyengar's Gains of Learning Bill, which has been struggling hard for support in Madras. A Bombay gentleman, the Hon. Mr. Garud, explained and supported its provisions in an able speech. It is pleasant to note that the special resolution in favour of efforts for the elevation of the outcastes was strongly supported; and one may recall the fact that Mr. Sankaran Nair, in his presidential address to the Congress, remembered the Pariahs in the same breath with the Brahmins. An earnest and energetic endeavour towards social regeneration is obviously in hopeful progress in India, and all right-minded people in England—and elsewhere—will extend to their Indian brethren the warmest sympathy and encouragement in the arduous and noble struggle.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, January 20.—Commenting, at the Liverpool Conservative Club, on the calls now made upon Cabinet Ministers to speak outside Parliament, Mr. Chamberlain said that, thanks to the kindly enthusiasm of their friends, they were expected to go up and down the country like political bagmen, vaunting their wares, and depreciating those of their opponents. He expressed pity for the members of the Opposition, who were called upon to make bricks without straw. Mr. Chamberlain had something to say also of the circumstances which had driven him to desert the Liberal party, and of the qualities of the "Unionist blend."

Sir H. Campbell - Bannerman, M.P., speaking at South Queensferry, said he was glad to hear from Mr. Chamberlain that we could not ultimately avoid isolated action with regard to the East. As to Egypt, the time had arrived when the Government should explain what the present movement of troops meant.

Lord Wolseley, speaking at the annual dinner of the North London Rifle Club, in response to the toast of "The Army and Navy," said that if the army was not in such perfect condition as could be wished, it was because they had been attempting to fill the quart pot of the army abroad out of the pint pot of the army at home. He also referred to the powers of endurance which British soldiers had exhibited in the Indian Frontier War.

The Pekin Correspondent of the *Times* said that at an interview with the Tsung-li-Yamên on Wednesday, the Russian Chargé d'Affaires threatened reprisals and the withdrawal of Russia's friendship and protection if Ta-lien-wan were opened. The Chinese, while recognising the advantages of the British terms as affording the best hope of maintaining the integrity of the empire, were wavering. Some of the Vienna journals commented on the statements of British ministers with reference to the Chinese question. The observations of the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* and the *Vaterland* were friendly in tone, but the *Deutsche Zeitung*, the Pan - Germanic organ, urged a "ruthless economic campaign" of the great Continental Powers against England.

Mr. Gladstone's neuralgic pains continued to give trouble, but according to the latest news from Cannes there was no cause for anxiety as to the general state of his health.

FRIDAY, January 21.—Sir J. Westland's Bill, providing for the issue of currency notes in India against gold deposited in London, was passed by the Legislative Council in Calcutta, with the addition of a proviso that the Secretary of State be given the option of paying gold into the Treasury provided that India paid an equal sum into the currency reserve in Calcutta.

General Sir Bindon Blood issued a farewell Order to the troops forming the Boner Field Force, in which he stated that all the terms required from the Bonerwals had been fully complied with, and that the results of the Expedition were entirely satisfactory. The Force was to be broken up.

The polling for the election of a member for the St. Stephen's-green Division of Dublin took place. The candidates were Mr. Campbell, Q.C. (Conservative) and Count Plunkett (Nationalist). Mr. Campbell was elected. Exceptional interest was taken in the contest because of the disclosures that had been made as to the condition of the "lodger" register, and because of the co-operation of the two wings of the Nationalist party.

Mr. Dunbar Barton, Q.C., Solicitor-General for Ireland, was re-elected without opposition for Mid-Armagh.

With respect to Mr. Gladstone's health, Reuter's correspondent at Cannes stated that "there has been no recuperation

of strength during his stay at Cannes," and that the aged statesman was very weak. Nothing had occurred, however, "to cause immediate apprehension."

The Constantinople Correspondent of the *Daily News* stated that the Russian Ambassador had made energetic representations to the Porte on the subject of Armenia, and had even intimated that unless the incursions of the Kurds across the border were stopped, Russia might find an occupation of Turkish territory necessary.

The news from Pekin regarding the prospects of the loan negotiations continued to be unfavourable. From Yokohama it was stated that a fleet of nine warships would sail for Chinese waters within a week.

SATURDAY, January 22.—A meeting of the Cabinet, at which, it was understood, the state of affairs in the Far East was discussed, was held. The meeting was unusually prolonged.

A despatch by Sir W. Lockhart, written in December, was published in Calcutta, in which he attributed the necessity of the second attack on the Dargai heights on October 20 to the failure of General Yeatman-Biggs to carry out certain orders he had previously given, and remarked that the attack itself was not carried out in the manner which he had intended, and, as he thought, clearly indicated.

Reports received from the various observing parties stationed at different points in India indicated that the meteorological conditions for observing the total eclipse of the sun were almost uniformly very favourable. During the period of totality all the observing parties succeeded in obtaining numerous photographs.

Replying to a memorial addressed through the Civil Service Commissioners by eminent members of the University of Oxford, in which it was suggested that the age limit for the Civil Service of India should be made identical with that in force for first-class clerkships in the Home Service, Lord G. Hamilton expressed the opinion that it was premature at present to reopen the question. The new regulations, he added, only came into force in 1896, and had not yet had a fair and adequate trial.

The Executive Committees of the ten trade unions engaged in the engineering dispute decided to accept "the terms as mutually adjusted at the Westminster Conference," with the "notes" recently published by the Employers' Federation, as the conditions of settlement of the dispute. A circular was to be forwarded on Monday to each of the branch secretaries of the trade unions. In accordance with the rules of the principal unions, another ballot of the members needed to be taken before the terms could be finally accepted. The ballot was to be so taken that the voting might end by Thursday. In the circular the secretaries of the principal unions advised the members of the unions to accept the terms *and notes*, pointing out that the notes added by the employers made considerable modifications in the intention of the terms. They add also that the financial strain upon the unions had recently become very severe.

It appeared that this progress towards a settlement was largely due to the wise and well-timed mediation of the editor of the *Daily News*.

In the French Chamber, M. Méline, the Premier, replying to M. Cavaignac's interpellation, said that the Government could not communicate Captain Lebrun-Renaud's report on the alleged confession of Dreyfus, as once a discussion was opened the judicial character of the affair would be altered and the Chamber would carry out what would be tantamount to a revision of the trial. M. Cavaignac thereupon expressed satisfaction with the Minister's statements, and withdrew his interpellation. Subsequently the Chamber witnessed a scene of violence such as had never before been recorded in its history. While M. Jaurès was speaking he was interrupted by the Comte de Bernis, who charged him with being in the pay of the Dreyfus Syndicate. M. Jaurès retorted, and one of his colleagues of the Extreme Left struck the Count. The various parties then took sides, and a free fight ensued, in which coats were torn off, and blows were freely exchanged. M. de Bernis later approached M. Jaurès, whose back was turned, and dealt him a heavy blow which knocked him from the tribune. The uproar which ensued was such that the President finally suspended the sitting. When the Chamber was cleared members endeavoured to continue the fight in the lobbies, but found there a detachment of troops which had been summoned when the President left.

SUNDAY, January 23.—Mr. Gladstone, who had been suffering much pain and depression of spirits at Cannes, appeared to be much better. Amongst the inquiries as to his health was one from the Queen.

Many disorderly meetings were held in Paris, and anti-Jewish rioting took place at Algiers. Cavalry charged the mob with drawn swords, and one person was killed, while many were injured.

MONDAY, January 24.—The French Chamber was occupied with the resumption of the debate concerning the sentence on Dreyfus commenced on Saturday, when the sitting was terminated in disorder. M. Jaurès was now the principal critic of the Government, and his speech and those of his friends were replied to by the reiteration of the Premier that the Government would not consent to debate in the House the details of a "judicial" procedure. The discussion occupied the entire sitting, and ended in the adoption of an Order of the Day approving the declarations of the Government, by 376 votes against 133.

The Duke of Devonshire received a deputation from the Senate of the University of London, the Teaching Bodies of England, the learned Societies, and Medical Schools, to urge upon the Government the reintroduction of the Bill of last year for the reconstruction of London University as a teaching body. The Duke said the Government were fully alive to the importance of the matter, and were convinced by the Report of the Cowper Commission of the necessity of such reform.

Lord Hardwicke presided at a meeting of the National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations, at which a memorandum was presented and adopted setting forth the policy which should guide the Unionist and Moderate Party in the County Council elections next March. Lord Onslow, who is supposed to be Under-Secretary for India, spoke with confidence on the issue of the contest.

TUESDAY, January 25.—Mr. G. N. Curzon addressed a Unionist demonstration at Bolton. With regard to the appointment of a Governor of Crete, the Government, he said, had been willing to accept any competent subject of the Great Powers, or, if none such was forthcoming, any representative of the smaller Powers. They had been willing to accept the last candidate, who was perhaps the best of all; but some adverse and mysterious influences had developed themselves, and if they asked him at what stage matters had now arrived, or whether the appointment was "hung-up," he could not tell them, because, honestly, he did not know. As to the operations in the Soudan, the Government cherished the hope that in less than three years from the time when the enterprise was undertaken it would be carried through to a successful issue. We had lately exchanged with King Menelik the ratification of a treaty which was concluded with him in the spring of last year, and it was hoped before long to accredit a representative to his Court. With regard to our policy on the North-West frontier of India there was only one course to be pursued, and it was one not of heedless annexation but of pacific control. As to our relations with China, Mr. Curzon said that if exceptional privileges were demanded by or were conceded to foreign Powers, Great Britain had a right to demand "compensating" advantages for herself.

WEDNESDAY, January 26.—Lord George Hamilton delivered at the Chiswick Constitutional Club a speech upon Indian frontier policy, declaring *inter alia* that it was the late Liberal Government which made the road from Peshawar to Chitral. We report and discuss the speech elsewhere.

Owing to the continued disturbance in Baluchistan, Colonel Mayne, with a strong force, was to advance from Pasni to relieve the Nazim of the Khan of Khelat, whose position was reported to be critical. It was stated that Balush Khan intended to oppose the British advance.

At the instance of the British Consul at Muskat, the gunboat "Lapwing," in the Persian Gulf, seized the steamer "Baluchistan," which had on board a quantity of arms and ammunition the destination of which was uncertain.

THE "FORWARD" FRONTIER POLICY.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AND MR. A. E. FLETCHER AT CARDIFF.

We take from the *South Wales Daily News* of Saturday last (January 22) the following report:—

Last evening at the Cory Memorial Hall, Cardiff, a lecture was given under the auspices of the Cardiff Liberal Association by Mr. A. E. Fletcher (late editor *Daily Chronicle*) on the forward policy in India. By securing as chairman Mr. D. Naoroji, known the world over as "Lord Salisbury's black man," the Cardiff Liberal Association had secured a double attraction. There was consequently a large and very representative attendance. Mr. D. Naoroji presided, and was supported by Mr. A. E. Fletcher, Councillor Sydney Robinson (vice-president of the Cardiff Liberal Association), Rev. J. Williamson, Principal Edwards, Messrs. Morgan Jones, W. Spurgeon, W. C. Parry, Councillors Lloyd Meyrick, Edward Thomas, J. Chappell, W. H. Allen, A. Good, J. J. Buist, Dr. W. T. Edwards, Messrs. W. Lewis, J. Munn, D. Davies, T. Taylor, J. G. Grant, C. Griffiths, S. Jones, S. Fisher, T. L. Powell, W. J. Travers, William Jenkins, J. Harding, J. Ings, Morgan Thomas, J. H. Payne, F. J. Beaven, John Ferguson, Price Jones, E. Roberts, and H. Allgood (secretary of the Cardiff Liberal Association).

The Secretary read letters of apology for non-attendance from Alderman D. Jones (deputy mayor), Richard Cory, E. Beaven, Councillor T. Andrews, all of whom were absent on Corporation business in London, and from Mr. John Duncan, who had started on the previous day for the South of France.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI'S SPEECH.

The CHAIRMAN, who was very heartily received, began by thanking the Cardiff Liberal Association for having done him the honour to ask him to preside that evening. He knew enough of Mr. Fletcher to

know that they were going to listen to a very instructive lecture. (Cheers). First, however, with their permission, he would like to say a few words about the subject himself. At the outset, what was the forward policy? What did it mean, and from what did it arise? It arose from a fear of Russian invasion. First he would appeal to his audience as Englishmen of average common-sense, and ask them to listen while he told them something of this stupid and suicidal policy. (Cheers). On the North-west frontier of India they had a barrier created by nature, as strong as they could possibly have put up, inhabited by tribes which had dwelt there for thousands of years. They were the old heroes of the Persian Empire, and at the present time, as they knew, they were showing the British troops in India what they were made of. It was to the interest of these people to see that Russia did not walk over their territory. These tribes were not such fools as many people supposed them to be, and would never allow Russia to step in and crush them. It was to the interest of England to let these tribes alone, as they formed our first line of defence. (Cheers.) If France were going to invade England what would be thought if we sent over the Channel and put troops in France to try and stop them coming, instead of trusting to our Navy, our first line of defence? (Laughter and cheers.) Yet this was pretty much the policy that the present Government was pursuing with regard to India, and that was the forward policy. Let them go right to the borders of Russian territory by annexing Afghanistan, and what would they have to do? They would then have to put an immense army there for fear of invasion or a rising by the tribes whose affection would have been alienated. It was simple madness to go to the very front line of the Russians themselves and give them all the advantages that they had not at the present time. (Cheers.) Now, what was all this frontier war that was now going on, and who was responsible for it? Experience might have been learned from previous Afghan wars. The British Indian authorities never learned anything—(laughter and cheers)—they learned their own selfishness and nothing else. The policy was nothing more or less than that fixed by Lord Beaconsfield, and when Lord Lytton was sent there he was sent because Lord Lawrence and Lord Northbrook steadily resisted the forward policy, they having decided that it would be simply stupid to place the British in this way in the hands of the Russians. The alleged reason for carrying on this policy was that it was for the maintenance of British rule. The whole question had been repeatedly admitted in the House of Commons that it was an entirely Imperial question. It was for the sake of Europe and not for the sake of India. India had not the slightest voice in it. Anglo-Indians represented matters in such a way that the people in England thought that they were doing glorious things. Anglo-Indians were liberal with India's money. They took millions of money from India. People in England thought that England was shedding blessings and blessings on India, but what was really the result? War, famine, and pestilence. (Cries of "Shame.") That was the result of Anglo-Indian authority in India for 150 years. Who was to blame? The British had done what they could to lay down a clear and righteous policy. The British Parliament had acted in this way, and the Queen's proclamation in the name of the British people has declared that India shall be governed on righteous principles. But there the British stopped. They employed servants who only knew how to bleed India. That was their only object from beginning to end. Despite the Royal proclamations and the resolutions of Parliament, the British authorities in India, to whom the British had given this trust, had brought the country into its present condition. Had the British forgotten that in the end they were responsible for all this misery and suffering? The policy was unrighteous and un-British. He could use far stronger words, but he did not, though if they were Indians themselves, they would not be satisfied with strong words, but would, he believed, go in for strong deeds (Cheers.) From an economic point of view the British rule had been a great curse. That was to say on principles contrary to those laid down by the British Parliament and British Sovereign. The consciences of the authorities made them cowards. They knew that the Indian mind was opening, and they knew that if the present course was kept up the result would be disastrous. They thought that the only way to hold the nation was by force, and he would tell them that it could not be held in that way. (Cheers.) These very authorities created discontent and disloyalty by continually teaching the people that they must remain under their heels, and that there is no other remedy. Lord Salisbury himself had admitted that the conduct of the British Indian authorities had been political hypocrisy. Lord Lytton wrote deliberately, "British Indian authorities have practised deliberate, transparent subterfuges, and deceived the people by making promises and breaking them." But suppose India were contented. They would then have a mighty country, with 300 millions of inhabitants at their back, a splendid lot of fighting men who would fight for the British because they knew that they would be treated well. (Cheers.) If the present policy were continued, there must be some day a terrible retribution. The British authorities there were in reality turning people into helots, for the people of India had no voice in their own affairs; they would not possess that which was their birthright. (Cries of "Shame.") A great and grave responsibility lay with the British people, and especially with the British elector, to see that this great injustice should come to an end. There had been of late a great discussion going on about a breach of faith in Chitral. Breaches of faith had been the whole life and system of Christian British rule in India. They had only to note what Lord Lytton and Lord Salisbury had said to see that. In conclusion, the speaker pictured what India might become if a different policy were pursued towards it. (Loud cheers.)

MR. FLETCHER'S LECTURE.

Mr. A. E. Fletcher, who was very heartily received, started by a reference to the General Election of 1895. It might be said that Wales, Ireland, and Scotland remained true. Cardiff certainly went wrong, but still on the whole Wales had remained right, and the whole of the Conservative members might be sent up to London in a "growler," especially if Mr. Maclean were accommodated with a box seat. (Loud laughter.) It was England that had deserted wholesale. England that had given the strongest majority to the weakest Government that had ever been trusted with the control of the destinies of the British Empire. (Cheers.) John Bright used to say that "nations, like individuals, occasionally went mad." (Laughter.) Now one of the maddest things that the English elector had done was to reject the distinguished politician and reformer, the staunch and tried friend of the democracy of India, the faithful servant of the democracy of the United Kingdom, who had done them the honour to come from London to take the chair for them that evening—(loud cheers)—and to deliver that admirable speech to which they had listened with so much interest. (Renewed cheers.) He thought it a great misfortune that he (the Chairman) was not in Parliament now, but it was a moral certainty that he would be back there again, he hoped in combination with some other representative men of his own ancient and noble race—(cheers)—because the people of England were now, he was glad to know, beginning to take a real interest in the affairs of India. (Cheers.) The number present that evening was evidence of it—(cheers)—and he thought that when the next General Election—which might come much sooner than some of them expected—arrived the electors would persist in sending members to Parliament who would take an interest in the Indian question, and not allow the Indian Budget to be dismissed by half-a-dozen jaded members of Parliament at midnight at the fag end of a Session. Why, the Indian Budget was quite as important a document as the Budget of the United Kingdom, for it concerned a country as big as Europe, with 300 millions of inhabitants. (Cheers.) The late Mr. Fawcett had said that the gate to India lay not through Constantinople to Kabul or Herat, but that the gate was sound finance. (Cheers.) They wanted in Parliament men who would recognise this great fact and who would reverse the wanton and wicked policy of the present Government. This forward policy had already brought India to the verge of bankruptcy, and unless abandoned in favour of a policy of retrenchment and economy must bring that magnificent dependency to ruin. The bye-elections showed that the constituencies were beginning to get disgusted with this forward policy, for the bye-elections had been fought very largely on this question. It was a question confined not only to India but to Europe. The Indian question, thanks to Salisbury and Beaconsfield, had become the European question. The present Government had been weighed in the balance and been found wanting. (Cheers.). . . . Fear of a Russian invasion was the scare responsible for our forward policy in India, a scare of which the victims were a certain section of the military party, including—incredible as it might seem—no less an authority than Lord Wolseley and certain statesmen at home. This scare was absolutely childish. The British empire was not dying, and least of all in India, where Russia did not want to go, and even if she did, was physically prevented from doing so by impenetrable geographical barriers. The seeds of the present Indian frontier troubles were largely sown by Lord Roberts, who, as Governor of Kandahar, instead of trying to conciliate the people he had conquered, endeavoured to strike terror into them by daily hanging natives and producing a desolation which it would take 20 years to repair, and it was on such a man as this that a peerage and a pension were bestowed. ("Shame.") The Chitral expedition marked the third round in the grand Afghan game, which commenced in 1839, and which was a wanton and wicked policy. The present war in India was entirely unnecessary, and was undertaken in direct violation of the solemn pledge given by the late Government that Chitral should not be annexed. Was not this annexation an act of treachery, which brought disgrace on British honour, and tended to discredit the British name abroad? (Cheers.) They were carrying on this war with a people whom for their own protection they ought to be on the best of terms with, and that not only at the cost of millions of money but of brave men's lives. The three rounds in the Afghan grand game had already cost the India people not far short of a hundred millions sterling, and all this within the last 19 years. The wealthiest nation on the face of the globe could not stand an expenditure like that, and yet they were going to attempt to sweat it out of a people whose average income was £2 a year. ("Shame.") Was it not time that they put a stop to this monstrous policy? (Cheers.) To remedy this state of affairs they must get rid in India of objectionable English vested interests, abandon the forward policy, and adopt a policy of liberty, equality, and fraternity. (Cheers.) They must abandon their outposts beyond India's impenetrable frontier and retire from Quetta, and thereby relieve the Indian expenditure of an enormous burden, including the subsidy of £200,000 yearly paid to the Amir. They must also relieve India of the cost of an alien Civil Service by appointing for the task native Indians. Indignantly repudiating the taunt that those who, like himself, advocated these reforms were "Little Englanders," he said they desired an England great, not by territorial extension, but great by industry, peaceful art, and moral position. (Cheers.)

On the motion of Councillor E. Thomas seconded by Mr. F. J. Beavan, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded the lecturer, and a similar compliment to the Chairman, on the motion of the Rev. J. Williamson, seconded by Mr. J. Munn, brought the meeting to a close.

The *South Wales Daily News*, in the course of a leading article, upon the speeches, said:—The Cory Memorial Hall was comfortably packed last night to listen to a speech on the Indian frontier policy from Mr. Naoroji, whom Lord Salisbury, with a most ungentlemanly desire to cast insult upon our Indian fellow-subjects, described as a "black man," although his skin is as white as, if not whiter, than is Lord Salisbury's, and also a lecture on the same subject by Mr. Fletcher, formerly editor of the London *Daily Chronicle*, and now proprietor and editor of the *New Age*. Both speech and lecture were replete with valuable information concerning India, and with exposures and condemnations of the Salisbury-Beaconsfield "Forward" policy both in Europe and Asia, which would be new to a Cardiff audience because not of the usual staple material of public addresses. They were both studded with points and illustrated by anecdote—at

least Mr. Fletcher's lecture was told with anecdote graphically, which will fix them firmly in the memory of the hearers. . . . Both speech and lecture were brimful of fact and argument, all tending to show, and most of them conclusively proving, the mischievous evils of the "Forward" policy not only to India but to this country. For that "Forward" policy, as Mr. Fletcher showed, is the basis and the inspiration of the foreign policy of this Salisbury Government in Europe as in Hindustan, and nothing but evil has come of it, and nothing but evil can ever result from it. . . . . Mr. Naoroji exhaustively discussed the questions, What does the "Forward" policy mean and from what does it spring? and he showed that it arose from a simulated fear, or an absurdly coward fear, of the Anglo-Indians of a Russian invasion of India; whilst both he and Mr. Fletcher maintained that that could never happen—Mr. Fletcher contending that Russia has not the remotest desire to invade India—if our Indian policy were based upon the statesmanlike policy of conciliating the independent mountain tribes on our northern and north-west frontier, instead of irritating them and awakening their enmity by invading their territories and annexing portions of them, to which we have not an atom of right or title, and otherwise wantonly forcing them to become our foes. This "Forward" policy, as it is called, of the military party in India is the main cause, as the two speakers showed, of many of the evils under which India is suffering, and the sole cause of the recent uprising of the Indian frontier tribes, and of the consequent suffering and bloodshed and enormous loss of life and expenditure of money. That immense expenditure, we are now told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, will exclusively fall upon India, which is already impoverished and almost entirely drained of her resources, and which is, in addition, suffering under the twin plagues of pestilence and famine.

INDIAN FRONTIER POLICY.

MR. CURZON'S VIEWS.

Mr. G. N. Curzon, M.P., in the course of a speech at Bolton on Tuesday night (January 25), said:—

With respect to the Indian frontier question, it was surprising what a change had come over the Opposition. As the time for the meeting of Parliament drew near their expletives became milder, their adjectives watered down. (Loud cheers.) If the late Government felt the honour of the Government was involved in not making the road to Chitral, it did at least seem a curious thing they should have summed up those scruples of theirs in a simple secret telegram of less than fifty words, and instead of telling the Viceroy what they felt and desired themselves on their full responsibility as a Government, they should only have told the Viceroy what might be felt or was felt by other people. There was no need to labour the matter, however, because the charge of a breach of faith had already been dropped. When Parliament drew near, charges which it was difficult to sustain disappeared from the scene, just as the charge of a breach of faith had been found to be baseless. Upon Parliament meeting, all the platform politics of the recess about the Indian frontier question would evaporate in a general agreement as to the only policy and line of action that could be pursued. He said this, first, because he had read the speech of Lord Kimberley, and, secondly, because the more the question was examined the more it would be found that there was only one policy which could be pursued with respect to our Indian frontier, and which might be summed up in the single sentence, "Not heedless annexation, but pacific control." (Hear, hear.) In carrying out that policy, Liberal Governments and statesmen had, on the whole, been more forward than Conservative Governments and statesmen. Lord George Hamilton would reply in Parliament to the severe criticism passed upon his office and himself. He trusted that the result of the debate would be to secure, not the victory of one party or the defeat of another—for in matters connected with India we did not want party triumphs or defeats—(cheers)—but he hoped that the debate would result in the vindication of the principles of political sagacity and of common sense. (Cheers.)

SPEECH BY LORD G. HAMILTON.

Lord George Hamilton, M.P., Secretary of State for India, was the principal guest at the annual dinner of the Chiswick Constitutional Club on Wednesday night.

Replying to the toast of "The Houses of Parliament and our Member," Lord George Hamilton said he looked forward to the next session of Parliament with the assurance that the recent platform chatter at the expense of his particular department would be reduced to its proper dimensions in the House of Commons. There was no special question with which Parliament would have to deal when it reassembled, because a general spirit of unrest seemed during the past two years to have created complications over the whole of the globe. It had evinced itself with special seriousness as regarded the British power on the North-west frontier of India. Despite the platform criticisms of their opponents on the Government's policy with regard to the frontier, he had every reason to believe that in the next session the Cabinet would be able to formulate a policy for the future administration of the tribes and their territory which would meet with unanimous acceptance and that this policy, without abandoning the declared principles of the Government, would be the means of preventing a recrudescence of the troubles with the tribes. (Cheers.) In a recent speech Mr. Asquith said that the culminating blunder of the Government's so-called forward policy was the construction of a road two hundred miles in length between Peshawar and Chitral over territory over which we had no right and title. The Radical papers had assumed for months past that he (the speaker) and his Government were responsible for the construction of the roads. And until now he had never troubled to contradict them. But as a matter of fact it was made by the late Radical Government, and was in existence before he came into office as Secretary for India. (Laughter and cheers.) Radical papers. Radical politicians, and lastly Mr. Asquith, had been denouncing him for an action for which their own party was entirely responsible. After he came into office he entered into an arrangement with the tribes to keep up these roads and bridges which the late Government had made, and he was pleased to say that, despite the frontier troubles, the traffic over them had increased 800 per cent. since the present Government came into power. The road, said Mr. Asquith, was made over territory to which we had no more right than we had to the Republic of France. Now, Mr. Asquith seemed to be unaware that there existed an Act of Parliament which decreed that any military expedition sent by the Indian Government outside the frontiers of India must be formally notified to the British Parliament in order to legalise the expenditure for such expedition. When Sir Henry Fowler was in office as Secretary for India, he defended the sending of an expedition without that formal notice to this particular territory, by stating that the country was within the external frontiers of India, and therefore did not come within the scope of the Act. What Mr. Asquith had practically done was to repudiate an international arrangement, made by a Government of which he was a member. (Cheers.) It was said a party motion was to be moved in the House of Commons at the opening of the Session, condemning the Government's frontier policy. He ventured to predict with much assurance that such a motion would not be moved by any member of the Front Opposition Bench. The Opposition leaders were too clever to commit the error of making a party motion in the House of Commons on a brief drawn up from their recent platform speeches. Whatever were the merits or demerits of the recent frontier policy, it was based upon international arrangements made by their opponents when in office, and subscribed to over and over again by both political parties. He was pleased to be able to say that our relations with Russia, the other Great Power in Central Asia, were very satisfactory. Both England and Russia had honestly kept their mutual obligations as to frontiers. (Cheers.) It was also satisfactory to know that the heavy fighting which had recently taken place had not created any animosity towards us even on the part of the tribes we had defeated—indeed, the first thing a headman of the Orakzais asked an English officer, after surrendering to him, was that his three sons might serve us in one of the crack Pathan regiments. (Cheers.) Lord George Hamilton proceeded to refer at length to the financial position of India, expressing the opinion that a loan from the British Exchequer was neither necessary nor desirable at the present juncture. England could, however, help India in a better way. In this country there was a great accumulation of idle capital which India was greatly in need of for the development of its resources. Capitalists would not invest their money in India because of the fluctuations of the exchange, and thus India's immense productive capacity was not fully developed. When he came into office he determined to do his best to secure a fixed rate of exchange, which could be effected either by a universal bimetallic arrangement among the nations or by the creation of a gold standard for India. He believed the former course was possible, but the negotiations to secure it had fallen through owing to the attitude assumed by France. India could not be allowed to remain in her present financial position. The difficulties to the creation of a gold standard were not so great as some believed, and it was not impossible that in the course of the next financial year the Government would take some steps towards securing it. If they could establish it, the advantage to India would be enormous, for the hoarded capital of this country would flow into it. That would do infinitely more good than the loan of a million or two.

THE COST OF THE WAR BEYOND THE FRONTIER.

STATEMENT BY THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.

SOME OPINIONS.

It may be well to reproduce from the *Bristol Times and Mirror* the full report of the astonishing statement made by Sir Michael Hicks Beach at Bristol, on January 19, and commented upon in our issue of last week:—

Mr. Lee referred in his remarks to the case of India. Well, speaking in Bristol a few weeks ago, I referred also to the position of India. And I said—I believe with the assent of my audience—that if it were shown that the necessities of India required it this country would not be slow to give whatever financial assistance was proved to be absolutely necessary to India. At that time, although I was able to correct some very extravagant apprehensions on the part of Mr. John Morley and his friends as to the cost of the frontier war, the present financial position and the future prospects of the coming year in India were not so clearly known as they are now. And I am very glad to be able to tell you that the financial position and those prospects have very much improved, and that from the last advices we have good reason to believe that the Indian Government do not consider it necessary that any financial help should be given by this country to India at the present time. (Applause.) I say that I am glad to be able to inform you of that, not merely on account of the saving of money; not at all. If India had passed through a period of great calamity, and if she really wanted it, I am sure our pockets would be opened to her (Hear, hear.) I do say it for this reason—that to my mind there is nothing more dangerous than that Parliament should vote the money of the taxpayers of the United Kingdom to aid the necessities of portions of the Empire which are not subject to Parliament in their administration or in their finances, and thus impose upon the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, through their representatives in Parliament responsibilities which those representatives have not themselves incurred. Now, supposing we were ready, as I am sure we should be ready, to recognise our Indian fellow-

subjects as our fellow-subjects of the Empire, to grant them whatever they wanted from our own resources, quite irrespective of any exceptional emergency, well, what would happen? Is it not clear that they would not very much regard how much they spent, that you might give a great inducement to unnecessary frontier wars on the part of the Indian Government, that you might give a still greater inducement to the Indian Government not to take more necessary precautions in providing for possible future famines; that, in fact, you would disturb the whole financial administration of a most important part of the Empire by assuming responsibilities which it ought to bear for itself? That is not good policy. That is not a policy which any Chancellor of the Exchequer of this country ought to be ready to adopt. (Cheers.) But there is one thing I should like to impress upon you in this matter. We talk constantly of Imperial taxation. But there is no such thing. It is a phrase which we have invented to differentiate the taxation which is levied for the necessities of the United Kingdom from that which is levied for the interests of local municipalities. But there is no Imperial taxation. What there is is taxation of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom, and I am very much afraid some of our Colonial fellow-subjects have been misled by this phrase "Imperial taxation" into a sort of idea that they have a kind of *quasi* right to as large an expenditure from the taxation of the United Kingdom as if they themselves contributed to it, and, further, that they are entitled to be consulted with regard to the provisions of the fiscal system, which ought to be adapted to meet our wants and needs, and not the wants and needs of those who do not contribute to our taxation.

Commenting on Sir Michael Hicks Beach's announcement, the *Star* wrote (leading article, January 20):—

Four of the "great, wise, and eminent" statesmen of the Front Benches addressed themselves last night to the war beyond the Indian frontier—Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Mr. Chamberlain, Lord George Hamilton, and Mr. Asquith. We may pass over the last three with two remarks, and two only. In the first place, Mr. Chamberlain, to whom the patriot is avowedly the commercial traveller, regretted the campaign because it was being carried on "in a territory which is worth nothing from a commercial point of view." In the second place, Mr. Asquith, following Lord Kimberley, accepted Mr. Balfour's vague and sinister "principles" of future policy—"with some reservations upon one or two points, and with a clear definition upon others." As the whole point of Mr. Balfour's policy is to secure "routes and positions"—in other words, an unlimited number of new Chitrals—beyond the frontier, it is not easy to see what definitions or reservations could possibly make it acceptable to Liberals; while the perils involved in Lord Kimberley's and Mr. Asquith's too innocent acquiescence may be estimated from the astounding announcement of the *Daily News* this morning that "happily the forward policy is dead"! But these things are, for the moment, of less importance than the declaration of Sir Michael Hicks Beach at Bristol, than which it would be difficult to conceive anything more amazing or more deplorable. Everybody—including even the *Times*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and the *Pioneer* of Allahabad—has assumed that part, and a large part, of the cost of the present war beyond the borders of India would be borne by the Imperial Exchequer. The reason for such a charge is, of course, as men like Sir Henry Brackenbury and Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt have pointed out, that the operations are not Indian but Imperial operations—they are part of an Imperial policy in mid-Asia. Now, a few weeks ago Sir Michael Hicks Beach announced that, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, he would be prepared to furnish a contribution from the British Treasury provided that, upon careful examination, the Indian finances proved unable to bear the strain. Last night he announced the results of his enquiries, and we say they are deplorable and amazing. Here is the gist of what he said:—"He was glad to tell them that the financial position had so much improved that, from the last advices, they had good reason to believe that the Indian Government did not consider it necessary that any help should be given by this country to India at the present time. (Applause)." The Indian "Government" be it observed—not the Indian taxpayers. And Sir Michael continued: "Suppose we were ready to grant them whatever they wanted from our own resources, quite irrespective of any exceptional emergency, was it not clear that they would not very much regard how much they spent, that there might be a great inducement to unnecessary frontier wars on the part of the Indian Government, and that there might be a still greater inducement to the Indian Government not to take necessary precautions in providing for possible future famine? In fact, it would disturb the whole financial administration of a most important part of the Empire by relieving it of responsibility which it ought to bear for itself. That was not good policy." Was anything more Pecksniffian ever heard? Just consider the position. Here is a handful of Englishmen in India who, under orders from Englishmen at home, have been pursuing for many years an English policy of advance in mid-Asia. The cost of this policy, which Colonel H. B. Hanna estimates at seven hundred millions of rupees up to the period preceding the present war, has fallen upon the indigent, unrepresented and famine-stricken taxpayers of India. At last, in the year of grace 1897, when famine, plague, earthquake, and cyclone supplied a lurid background to the theatre of war, a strong opinion manifested itself among men of all parties at home that, on this occasion at any rate, the British Treasury should pay a share of the expense. "No," says the austere and righteous Chancellor of the Exchequer, "that would be bad finance; you would be encouraging the Government of India to make war with other people's money." Will he not perceive—does he not grasp the fact—that English bureaucrats in India have been doing this all along—they have been making war, in the supposed interests of the British Empire, at the expense of the dumb taxpayers of India?

Sir Michael Hicks Beach says the Indian *Government* does not consider financial help desirable. That is, no doubt, true. And the *Pioneer*—the official Anglo-Indian journal—has told us why. It is because Anglo-Indians fear that if Parliament contributes to the cost of this war Parliament will in future take a closer interest in Indian administration. *Hinc illae lachrymae!* And while we are anxious to finance China—while we talk big about "British interests" the world over—we are to kindle a blaze in British India which will give every enemy of England in every part of the world his coveted opportunity and leave us powerless to protect either our colonies or ourselves.

The following letter from Sir Auckland Colvin appeared in the *Star* of January 22:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "STAR."

SIR,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of January 20 and copy of your issue of that date, with the marked article "What we Think—The Perish India Party." You ask if I agree in any portion of that article.

You may have seen that I have recently written on the financial aspects of this question in the *Nineteenth Century*. If you have read that paper you will have found that I agree with you in thinking that in proportion as the British advance westward leaves India behind it, and moves towards what you term mid-Asia, the possibility, no less than the propriety, of charging to Indian revenues the cost of so vast an undertaking become more and more open to question.

When, as I find the Press generally agree, measures taken beyond the frontier of India have been approved, in the interests of the Empire, by the Government of this country, but lead to expenditure calculated to strain Indian resources, this country should not boggle about the financial responsibilities of its own action. Nor does it, in this case, apparently. It is the Treasury which would override the nation, is it not?

It is true, unquestionably, that the best check on aggressive tendencies in the Government of India is difficulty in finding funds. But we should scarcely have expected to find a member of the present Cabinet using this argument against the Indian Government, or have anticipated such rebuke from such a quarter.

But there is someone else to be thought about and reckoned with beside the Government of India. There is the people of India. I should fear that if, after the hopes held out to them, it is decided to give no help to India, the irritation and discontent which exists there, if I may judge from the native Press and from my own native correspondence, will be very much increased. This alone is a sufficient reason for hesitating to leave the burden of operations which are universally condemned by Indians solely upon Indian shoulders.—Yours, etc.,

A. COLVIN.

January 21.

The *Star* of January 25 contained this letter from Colonel H. B. Hanna:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "STAR."

SIR,—Allow me to thank you for your excellent article of the 20th inst. entitled "The 'Perish India' Party." It will not be the fault of the *Star* if the British public is deceived by the sophisms with which the Government is seeking to bewilder its intellect and lull its conscience to sleep.

That the Viceroy and his Council should be anxious to put the best face possible on the financial condition of India is only natural, for pecuniary help from home would mean at least discussion, probably condemnation, of them and their methods; but that a British Chancellor of the Exchequer should be found playing their game, and trying to withdraw their frontier policy from the cognisance of the British Parliament is a very serious fact—far more serious, in my opinion, than would be that Parliament's denial to India of the pecuniary aid to which she has so good a claim, and of which she stands in such sore need, since it tends to destroy Englishmen's sense of responsibility for all that is done in a country to whose people a voice in the determination of their own affairs is rigorously denied.

Apart from this tendency to demoralise British public opinion, Sir Michael Hicks Beach's speech was less dangerous than that of Mr. Balfour, to which you also refer; for to refuse India assistance in pecuniary troubles produced by a false and short-sighted policy in the past is to do her a less injury than she will eventually have to suffer if the British Government succeeds in persuading us that they are about to adopt a new and better policy on the north-west frontier, when in reality no change is to be made in the conduct of border affairs, for the official programme of the forward party in India has always been *posts and roads and no annexation*.

The strength of that party has lain in its skill in confusing issues, and the only way to defeat it is to drag the truth again and again to light, as the *Star* and the *Saturday Review* and the *Manchester Guardian* and other provincial papers have been doing, week by week, for the last four months, thereby earning for themselves the gratitude of every man who has the welfare of India and the honour of Great Britain at heart.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

H. B. HANNA, Colonel.

Ashcroft, Petersfield, January 22.

The *Daily Chronicle* of January 21 gave its first leading article to the same topic, as follows:—

Our greatest dependency has rarely been so much afflicted as it has been within the past two years. Never in our time, with the exception of the last Afghan War, arising out of a similar situation, has there been so costly an enterprise upon the Indian frontier as the war, or series of wars, which resulted from the reversal by the present Government of the frontier policy agreed on by Lord Rosebery's Cabinet. That enterprise is certainly not an Indian, any more than an Imperial adventure. It is defended openly by its advocates on the ground that it is needful for the safety of the Empire, in the "far-off event" of a Russian attack. The theory is more than doubtful, but that may pass. For whether the policy be right or wrong, it is in either case an Imperial affair—an Imperial bulwark, as they contend, or an Imperial blunder, as all sensible men believe. There was, therefore, until now, no question in anybody's mind that the Empire

was going to pay. Seldom has the Exchequer been so well able to bear the burden. After a long depression, the wealth of the country is going up by leaps and bounds, and large surpluses are the ordinary rule. Nevertheless, we are informed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself that we will not, and that we ought not to, pay a penny of the war expenses. No one yet knows how much the total cost will be. It will almost certainly amount to ten millions. Probably there will be much more than that amount to pay before the account is closed. The Indian population will have to bear this burden if it must. Our bayonets in India will ensure the collection of the taxes so long as the natives are not actually starving. But we in Great Britain are beginning to realise that India is appallingly poor. We have been often told that even in the ordinary course of things taxation has almost reached the limit. We tell the Nonconformist that India simply cannot afford to drop the opium revenue, or the Government would starve. We know that only the other day we had to pour in alms to save whole provinces from starvation or from grievous distress. Even at this hour the plague is again mounting up to an alarming measure; and in direct connection with these disasters we have had open outbreaks of disaffection, and have gone through times of grave anxiety by reason of the rumours, true or false, which indicated that a semi-treasonable unrest was spreading far and wide over great areas of the peninsula. And yet these Ministers, who profess to be above all things the Imperial patriots, turn round and tell us that India, out of her poverty, must pay for our Imperial luxuries.

We have a certain respect for Sir Michael Hicks Beach. In many ways he is a good servant of the public. But he is hard-fisted; and his zeal for saving the millions in his care is not always according to discretion. As to this last astounding declaration, we can only say that, if it be maintained, it must be fought tooth and nail in Parliament, for the mere honour of England and for the best interests of our Indian Empire.

We need not refute the curious pleas by which the Chancellor supported this policy. His first point was that India was so well off that the Indian Government "did not consider it necessary that any help should be given to India at the present time." We can only say that, if in the unfettered choice of the Indian Government they prefer to pay this War Tax, they show a strange callousness as to the burdens of the populations over which they rule. The next argument is that as the expense was not incurred on a vote of the English Parliament, the English tax-payer should not bear it. That is flat pedantry. For the expense has all flowed absolutely from the vote by which the House of Commons, and after them the electorate, was pleased to place the present Government in power. Finally we have an argument which is unpleasantly familiar in the mouths of those who are busy in discountenancing private charity. "If you give them help, they will not be so careful—you will relieve them of responsibility." There are times when such an argument may be very wise. But surely of all absurd applications of it this is one of the worst. We shall be told, we suppose, that it was the Indian Government which advised the forward policy in Chitral, and that the Tory Cabinet at home merely indulged the fancy of its correspondents at Calcutta. But this is as idle as it is mischievous. Downing Street is alone responsible for the great decisions of Imperial policy, and if ever a Cabinet was responsible for a war it is in the case before us. If this decision be carried out, we, the richest people in the world, shall be treating the Indian populations, who are almost the poorest, with a meanness which would be despicable if it were a matter between man and man. We have often done so before, but seldom so flagrantly. It is a kind of "Little Englandism" of which those who are not credited with the true brand of Imperial patriotism would be ashamed. It can be carried, as other things are carried, by the votes of the Government's supporters in the House of Commons, and it can be enforced in India. No one will revolt, and if a few extra rayats are starved in the result, that will not matter. Sir Michael Hicks Beach will have a few more millions to play with, and Lord Salisbury's Government will be rid of that most cogent argument against a "forward policy"—the paying of the bill.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

As we announced last week, the British Committee of the Indian National Congress communicated with the National Liberal Federation with the view of supplying Indian speakers to take part in the bye-elections now pending.

The Secretary to the British Committee received the following reply, under date January 18, from the Assistant-Secretary to the National Liberal Federation :—

> I am desired by Mr. Hudson to acknowledge receipt of your letter of even date, and to thank you very much for the suggestion you are good enough to make in regard to providing speakers to address meetings at the pending bye-elections on the subject of the Indian policy of the present Government. We have sent a copy of your letter to each of the election agents and have suggested to them, if they care to avail themselves of the opportunity presented to them, that to save time they should put themselves into direct communication with yourself.

In the course of the next two days replies were received from the election agents in the Cricklade division, South Wolverhampton, and South-East Durham.

Arrangements were accordingly made for Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt and Mr. A. M. Bose to go to Durham, and one of the lecturers who co-operate with the British Committee—Miss Alison Garland—was commissioned to go to the Cricklade division. The election agent at South Wolverhampton wrote: "We are considering your kind offer, and if we find that you can be of service in the direction you indicate I will at once write."

On Monday night (January 24) Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt addressed a meeting near Darlington, and Mr. A. M. Bose a meeting at West Hartlepool. An account of Mr. Dutt's meeting is given below. We understand that both speakers met with a most cordial and enthusiastic reception, and their speeches, which were listened to with the closest attention, were punctuated with applause.

Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt returned to London on Tuesday, and the British Committee have made arrangements by which he will address a great meeting at Swindon to-morrow night in support of the candidature of Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice in the Cricklade division.

Mr. A. M. Bose remains for the present in South-east Durham, where he is addressing a large number of meetings and rendering most valuable service. The *Daily Chronicle* of Wednesday contained the following report from the constituency :—

> The impression prevails that the contest will be a close one, so both sides are straining every nerve to secure the much-coveted majority. The Liberals have every reason to feel gratified at the success which has attended the candidature of Mr. Richardson. Yesterday the party held no fewer than eight meetings. The Hon. A. M. Bose, M.A., of Bengal, spoke on the Indian policy of the Government, which, he said, had not only made enemies of a once friendly tribe, but had destroyed the confidence in this country of the entire Indian people. It was a dangerous and destructive policy, and was practically playing into the hands of Russia, which would now probably cultivate the friendship of the very tribes we had so grievously and unjustifiably injured. (Loud cheers)

The British Committee are also successfully engaged in making arrangements for future meetings. We print below a list of forthcoming engagements.

It was hoped that the Amraoti Congress would decide to send to England at least three or four delegates, thoroughly capable of interesting British audiences in Indian affairs. We hope shortly to receive information upon this important matter. The British Committee will be happy, and we have not the least doubt will be able without much difficulty, to arrange a series of good meetings for as many Indian speakers as are available.

In another part of our present issue we give a report of the speeches delivered at Cardiff, last Friday, by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. A. E. Fletcher.

Miss Alison Garland, who is addressing a series of meetings in the Cricklade division on behalf of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, and who will remain in the constituency until polling-day, is one of the most capable and successful lecturers on the staff of the National Reform Union. In her lectures on the "forward" frontier policy—in which she gives her audiences the substance of Colonel Hanna's admirable little volumes—she makes effective use of a large map, made by herself, of the North-West frontier and of the country beyond. In this way she is able to bring home to her hearers the meaning and the folly of the "forward" craze.

In her speeches in the Cricklade division Miss Alison Garland (who is also distributing a large amount of Congress "literature" on behalf of the British Committee) is laying special emphasis not only upon the India Government's policy of aggression beyond the frontier, but also upon its policy of repression within the frontier.

We give below a brief report of a lecture lately delivered by Miss Garland at Devonport.

We take the following from the *Daily News* of January 24 :—

> Mr. Baptista, who is assisting the Liberal candidate in South-East Durham, gave valuable aid to Sir Christopher Furness at York. The new Cambridge undergraduate's magazine, *The Cantab*, says that being introduced at his first meeting in York as a Cambridge "student," Mr. Baptista assured his hearers, with his customary wit, that though this was the case, he was certainly not a "kid," which statement was received with laughter and cheers; while on another occasion when interrupted by a cry of "black man," he said he preferred to be that rather than a "blackguard"—a specimen of repartee which delighted his audience. *The Cantab* understands that during his two days' visit to York he addressed no less than twelve public meetings.

In addition to the meetings to which reference has already been made, successful meetings, organised in connexion with the British Committee, have also been held at Devonport (January 17), Eastbourne (January 20), Dewsbury, Falmouth, Haslingden, Stretford, Bridgwater,

Exmouth, Manchester, Plymouth (various meetings), Heywood (January 19), and Eccles (January 24).

FORTHCOMING ENGAGEMENTS.

January.
29.—Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E., at Swindon.
February.
3.—Miss Alison Garland at Horwich (Lancashire).
9.—Miss Alison Garland at Leigh (Lancashire).
10.—Miss Alison Garland at Assett (Yorkshire).
11.—Miss Alison Garland at Bacup (Lancashire).
18.—Miss Alison Garland at Portsmouth.
21.—Mr. A. M. Bose at Wisbech.
24.—Miss Alison Garland at Saltash.
March.
9.—Mr. Gordon Hewart at the National Liberal Club, London.
13.—Mr. Gordon Hewart at Bradford.
14.—Mr. A. M. Bose at Peterborough.

Miss Garland will also lecture during February at Bradford, Watchet (Somerset), and in the Heywood division of Lancashire; and during March, at Street and Bristol.

In March, Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., will deliver an address before the East India Association on "Agricultural Banks in India."

A very interesting and successful meeting was held on Monday night (January 24) at Cockerton, near Darlington, in support of the Liberal Candidate for South East Durham, the seat having been vacated by the death of Sir Henry Havelock-Allan. Mr. Samuel, M.P., Mr. Cameron, M.P., and some other Liberal speakers spoke on the Home and Foreign Policy of the present Government, and Mr. Romesh Dutt, C.I.E., spoke on the Indian Frontier War. Mr. Dutt pointed out that not only at the present moment, but during the last twenty years and more the policy of the Tory Government on the North-West Frontier of India had been a policy of aggression and folly and disaster. Over thirty years ago Lord Lawrence, then Viceroy of India, warned his countrymen that: "If the course of events should ever bring us to a struggle with the Northern Power on our Indian frontier, the winning side would be the one which refrained from entangling itself in the barren mountains which now separate the two Empires; and the Afghans themselves, foreseeing this result, were likely in the end to throw their weight on the same side." In a late communication Lord Lawrence, replying to Sir Henry Rawlinson's Memorandum on the Central Asian Question, recorded: "We think it impolitic and unwise to decrease any of the difficulties which would be entailed on Russia, if that power seriously thought of invading India, as we should certainly decrease them if we left our own frontier and met her half way in a difficult country, and possibly in the midst of a hostile or exasperated population. We foresee no limits to the expenditure which such a move might require, and we protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India." Lord Lawrence, the speaker continued, was succeeded by Lord Mayo and then by Lord Northbrook, and during the years of Mr. Gladstone's Liberal administration at home, from 1868 to 1874, the sound policy laid down by Lord Lawrence was adhered to in India. But when the Tory Government came to power in 1874 they forced the Indian Government into a needless and disastrous war in pursuance of a restless Jingo policy. Lord Salisbury was then the Secretary of State for India, and the document in which he directed the Viceroy of India to interfere with Afghan affairs was, Mr. Dutt said, one of the most remarkable documents which had ever been recorded by a British Minister. Lord Salisbury wrote to Lord Northbrook: "The first step, therefore, in establishing our relations with the Amir upon a more satisfactory footing will be to induce him to receive a temporary Embassy in his Capital. It need not be publicly connected with the establishment of a permanent mission within his dominions. There would be many advantages in ostensibly directing it to some object of smaller political importance which it will not be difficult for Your Excellency to find, or if need be, to create. I have therefore to instruct you on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, without any delay that you can reasonably avoid, to find some occasion for sending a mission to Kabul." Lord Northbrook's reply to these tortuous and politically dishonest proposals was worthy of a Viceroy of India. He wrote: "If a mission is to be sent to Kabul, the most advisable course would be to state frankly and fully to the Amir the real purpose of the mission." And the Viceroy concluded his despatch by declining to carry out the unwise and unjust policy dictated by Lord Salisbury. He said: "We are convinced that a patient adherence to the policy adopted towards Afghanistan by Lord Canning, Lord Lawrence, and Lord Mayo, which it has been our earnest endeavour to maintain, presents the greatest promise of the eventual establishment of our relations with the Amir on a satisfactory footing; and we deprecate, as involving a serious danger to the peace of Afghanistan and to the interests of the British Empire in India, the execution, under the present circumstances, of the instructions conveyed in your Lordship's despatch." Lord Northbrook resigned soon after, and then, Mr. Dutt said, the Tory Government selected and sent out to India a foolish Viceroy to carry out a foolish policy. What followed was well known. Lord Lytton declared a needless and unjust war against Afghanistan in 1878, the Amir fled and died, his successor conceded all that the Viceroy wanted, the Treaty of Gundamuck was signed, and a British Envoy was received in Kabul. And when the Tory Government were yet singing their own praises over these results the terrible retribution came. The English Envoy was murdered, his escort was slaughtered, a fresh war broke out, twenty millions of money were needlessly sacrificed, and then we left Afghanistan, after a needless, profitless, expensive war. Lord Beaconsfield's Tory Government was overthrown in 1880, and Lord Lytton hastily resigned on the fall of the Ministry whose foolish mandates he had tried to carry out. During Mr. Gladstone's second Administration, from 1880 to 1884, Lord Ripon ruled India, gave the country repose and peace, tried to improve the condition of the people, gave them some representative institutions, and drew up a measure which was passed into law by his successor for giving fixity of tenure to the cultivators of Bengal. Unfortunately for India, the Tory Government came again into power in 1885, and had been in power ever since, with the exception of the brief periods of Mr. Gladstone's third and fourth Administrations. Since 1885 the policy of wasting Indian money in slowly and silently acquiring thousands of miles of barren rocks outside the Indian frontier had been pursued by Lords Dufferin, Lansdowne, and Elgin. The policy was unwise, because it weakened and did not strengthen our western frontier: and the policy was unrighteous and iniquitous, because it wasted the resources of India and impoverished her vast population. How poor, how resourceless the population of India was had been revealed by a succession of famines within Her Majesty's reign, the last of which occurred only last year. Three years ago, when Mr. Gladstone was in power, the Liberal Government wisely decided to withdraw from Chitral, a place two hundred miles outside the frontiers of India. But the Tory party came into power soon after, and wanted to show how they could pursue a spirited policy with other people's money, and they ordered the retention of Chitral at the cost of India. The result had been that over and above the calamities from which India suffered in 1897, over and above a famine and a pestilence, an earthquake, and an inundation, India had a disastrous war to which the lives of hundreds of brave and loyal soldiers, British and Indian, had been sacrificed. Wherefore these disastrous wars? Wherefore try to maintain forts and valleys and passes beyond India's natural frontier? The advocates of the "forward" policy had not an articulate answer to these questions. They hardly spoke of the danger of a Russian invasion now, because the incidents of the present war had shewn a Russian invasion with a large army to be impossible. The ostensible reason for the "forward" policy has ceased to exist, and a cloud of sophistry about keeping routes open, etc., etc., was all that was now urged in defence of an insane policy. It reminded Mr. Dutt of a kind of mollusc of which he had read in his younger days when he was studying for the Indian Civil Service examination. The mollusc had many enemies, and Providence had not provided it with the weapons of fair fighting. But Providence had provided it with something far more efficacious. When pursued by its enemies in water it could exude a kind of liquid which clouded the water, blinded its enemies, and allowed them to escape. The advocates of the "forward" policy in India, deprived of all ostensible reason for such an insane policy, were behaving like the mollusc and concealing themselves under a cloud of sophistry.

The following is a brief report (from the *Western Morning News*) of Miss Garland's lecture at Devonport on January 17:—

Under the auspices of the Devonport and Stonehouse Working Men's Liberal Association, Miss Alison Garland delivered a lecture on "The North-West Frontier of India", at the Liberal Club. Mr. Chew presided over a large attendance. Miss Garland illustrated her lecture by a large map which she had prepared showing the North-West frontier of India in 1876 and the "scientific frontier" of to-day. The mountains extending southwards from the Hindu Kush range protect the whole of the country bordering on Afghanistan. These mountains are pierced by only five passes—the Bolan, Chotiali, Gomul, Shutargarden and the Khyber, through which alone any large body of men could move. Besides the mountains, India is protected on the North-West for three-fourths of the distance by a desert, and the whole length by the River Indus. After describing the excessive difficulties confronting an army in any of these five routes and the strength of such fortifications held by the English at Rawal Pindi, Multan, Rajanpur, Lahore, and Sukkur, the lecturer went on to show the extent of the invading army that would be required to attack a country like India. Colonel Hanna estimated that 40,000 troops would be necessary to garrison Herat, Kandahar, and Kabul, supposing these towns to be chosen by the Russians as the base of operations; 10,000 for Herat, 10,000 for Kandahar, and 20,000 for Kabul, this larger figure being made necessary by the fierce and fanatical character of the people of that city, and also by the fact that during six months of the year its garrison must be self-sufficing, as the roads to the north and west are closed by snow. Then 30,000 men would be required to keep open communications between Kandahar and Herat and the armies in the field; and considering the wear and tear to which the invading armies would be subjected on their march, and the nature of the opposition they must be prepared to encounter at the end of it, 150,000 men would be wanted for the invading force; and, finally, a reserve of 50 000 would be necessary to reinforce the defeated army or cover its retreat. The camp followers would number 234,782 if we take the proportion usually chosen in the frontier campaigns. This enormous force would require feeding for 75 days, and for the carriage of food alone 375 000 camels would be required, for the baggage 75,000, and grain for the transport animals, 632,812; grand total, 1,082,812 camels or 2,165 624 mules. Miss Garland described the nature of the country in Afghanistan and Baluchistan, and showed how it was barely able to do more than feed its own inhabitants; where, therefore, the food and forage for the Russian army was to come from was a question not easily answered. The Russian railways in Asia were also described, and their capacity for conveying the huge invading army to its base of operations. The cost of the forward policy in India was enormous. The lecturer showed on the map the various expensive military railways that had been made, some of which are even now discarded, and the inutility of most of them. Over £30,000,000 of money had been spent on the frontier in the last fifteen years, and that did not include any of the charges of the present war. Miss Garland concluded her interesting address by a description of the economic condition of the Indian people, and the privations endured by them in paying for the expensive policy adopted by their rulers. A hearty vote of thanks to Miss Garland was proposed by Mr. Chew, and seconded by Mr. Straughan, and supported by Messrs. Kelly and Shepherd.

The lecturer at Heywood on January 19 was Mr. W. M. J. Williams. We take the following report from the *Bury Times*:—

The lecturer said he had long felt that the people of this country did not adequately recognise the responsibility they incurred in possessing India. Consequently he welcomed any sign of interest which might be taken in the subject. After speaking of the vastness of the Indian Empire and its population, religions, and literature, he said there was a direct connexion between the question of the cotton duties brought forward by the Unionists at the last election and the events which were transpiring at the present time in India. The Government of this country was largely aristocratic, but the Government of India was more aristocratic still—it was not of a representative character, it was the government of a subject people by a conquering people. Alluding to the expedition to the North-West of India, he asked his hearers to notice that the expedition was being carried far beyond the frontier, into the regions of the Hindu Kush. Showing that the election cries of the Unionists were associated with the recent expedition, he said that when the Tory Government was returned, aided by those cries, they constantly urged the Indian Government to go forward with these costly expeditions. By the Afghan campaigns of 50 and 25 years ago, and the expedition to Chitral of three years ago, a lot of money was lost with scarcely any return. The Hindus were a poor people, yet instead of trying to foster peace, contentment, and amity between them and the inhabitants of this country, and in spite of the famine, the plague, and the earthquake of last year, these expeditions were undertaken. Referring to the finances of India, he said the sooner some of the expense of these filibustering campaigns came from British sources the better it would be, for not until then would the British taxpayers do their duty and have a thorough investigation of the question. It seemed to be a very questionable proceeding on the part of the Tory Government to reverse the policy in regard to Chitral. The fact of the matter was that a military spirit was rampant in Indian government, and although much good had been done by the Civil Service in improving the country, it had been done much too expensively. For plain reasons, and for reasons of humanity, he trusted those present would give their attention to the fact that India was on the downward grade, and that it would ultimately involve a new charge upon the British taxpayer. (Applause.)

In moving a vote of thanks to the lecturer, Mr. Jackson said the war in which the Government were engaged beyond the North-West frontier was one of the most needless which this country had ever waged. The Government had shamefully broken their pledges to the tribesmen beyond that frontier. Those tribes were only fighting in defence of their homes, as Englishmen would do if they were placed in similar circumstances. (Applause.)

Mr. W. T. Slater seconded the motion.

Mr. J. Howarth asked if the policy now being pursued in India would tend to abolish the present cotton duties, of which they had heard so much?

The lecturer replied in the negative. He said that no reduction of taxation could be brought about while the present expenditure was going on, especially seeing that no more taxation could be obtained from Indian sources.

On Sunday evening, January 23, at Newton Hall, London, Mr. S. H. Swinny gave his third lecture on India, dealing with the benefits and evils of English rule. While admitting that peace had been established, he protested against comparing the present time only with the period of disorder due to the break-up of the Mogul Empire. Of the other advantages, the decrease of a few great crimes might in the end be counterbalanced by the increase of small ones, the result of landless poverty. Education and unity must be fatal to the present system; while the absence of corruption was found as well in native government under English influence. The growing poverty of British India was not due to a great increase of population. The growth was only ·94 per cent. per annum against 1·05 per cent. in Baroda, and 1·81 in Mysore, yet these states were admittedly prosperous. The source of poverty was to be found in alien rule, in the weakening of Indian institutions, in alien and oppressive laws, such as the law of debt, in the rigid assessment and collection of the land-tax, in the expense of alien government, and above all in the enormous tribute of India—the forced export of wealth to provide interest, home charges, pensions, etc., etc. Mr. Swinny dealt with each of these in detail, leaving the discussion of remedies till his lecture next Sunday on the "Future of India." He concluded with a protest against Sir Michael Hicks Beach's decision to leave the whole cost of the war beyond the frontier to be paid by India.

"AS OTHERS SEE US."

The *Manchester Guardian*, reviewing our eighth (1897) volume, wrote (January 20):—

The eighth volume of INDIA forms a valuable record of matters connected with the government of Hindustan, and in particular is useful as a means of quickening the public conscience in this country as to British responsibility for the well-being of the varied races of the Indian empire. The present volume closes the monthly series of INDIA, and with the present year it begins as a weekly. We wish it all success.

Reviewing the recently issued Vol. VIII of INDIA, the *Westminster Gazette* (January 11) said:—

Contains much information for all interested in the great question of India. Many of the articles are written by leading authorities. A supplement gives a full report of the debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, which many will find convenient for reference.

ET CAETERA.

Lord G. Hamilton was reported to have said in his speech at Acton, on January 19, that the advance of Russia in Central Asia was not only a factor in connexion with British policy, "but a subject to which they ought to give their undivided attention." On Wednesday night he explained at Chiswick that this was a mistake in the report. The word "not" was accidentally omitted from the last clause, which should have read, "he felt now that it was not a factor to which," etc.

It appears that Sir M. M. Bhownaggree, M.P., was among those present at the Chiswick Constitutional Club on Wednesday night to hear Lord George Hamilton's speech. Will Sir M. M. Bhownaggree, then, defend the policy which led up to the present war? Will he join Lord G. Hamilton and Sir M. Hicks Beach in deprecating a contribution from the British Treasury? We must wait and see.

We are glad to see that the *Bombay Gazette Overland Summary*, of December 18 last, includes as a special supplement an instructive compilation of opinions regarding the Indian National Congress "by eminent critics unconnected with it." These critics include Sir William Hunter, Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., Sir Charles Dilke, M.P., Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., the late Lord Randolph Churchill, Lord Lansdowne, Sir Richard Garth, Q.C., the *Statesman*, the *Daily Chronicle*, and the *Times*.

The P. and O. s.s. "Massilia," leaving London for Calcutta on January 28, has booked among other passengers the following:—Mr. J. Leitner, Mr. Rowat, Lieut. Smyth, R.N., Sir Joseph Crossland, Lady M. Crosse and Miss Crosse.

The lists of passengers by the P. and O. s.s. "Ravenna" (for Marseilles) and "Egypt" (for Bombay) which leave London on February 1, include the names of Capt. and Mrs. Shadwell, Lieut. T. C. Drever, Capt. W. O. M. Moss, Lieut. E. C. Dagleith, Capt. and Mrs. C. P. Price and child, Capt. O'Boyen, Capt. and Mrs. Daniells, Lieut.-Col. and Mrs. Wyllie, Lady Melliss and child, Hon. M. Erskine, Col. and Mrs. Jameson, Mr. Syed Hassan, and Col. Ditmas.

Among the passengers by the P. and O. s.s. "Oriental" (from Bombay), which arrived at Brindisi on January 21, are:—Col. H. Hamilton, Mr. Maffeit, Sir Charles Freemantle (for Malta), Capt. Wickender, Capt. Lowe, Lieut. H. P. Bell, and Major McSwiney.

The B.I.S.N. Co.'s s.s. "Goorkha," which leaves London on February 4, carries the following passengers (for Madras):—Mr. R. J. Hunter, Mr. Innes, Mrs. Meyer and three children, and Mr. W. Bascomb. For Calcutta:—Mr. and Mrs. Ambrose and infant, Mr. and Mrs. Green, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Scaife, Mr. W. J. Moyes, Mr. T. C. Wilson, Mr. E. G. Moyes, Mr. Geo. Ogilvie, Capt. L. Smythe, and Mr. G. Currie.

Mr. M. Seshagiri Sastri, M.A., Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, Presidency College, Madras, has brought out (says the *Madras Standard*) the first of a series of "Essays on Tamil Literature." "Now that Mr. Sastri has entered the arena, we feel sure that other Tamil scholars will bring to bear their own researches on the discussion, and help him in his attempt to secure some historical and chronological landmarks in the wide sea of Tamil literature."

Prince Ranjitsinhji, who was interviewed in Melbourne upon the result of the second England *v.* Australia match, said that the wicket was all in favour of the Australians. The winning of the toss decided the match. In the first innings, the respective scores of 520 and 315 were big, no doubt; but the smaller total of 150 obtained by the Englishmen in their second venture was the natural consequence of deterioration of the wicket. The bowling was weak on both sides, except towards the finish. Complaints have been made of the treatment of the Englishmen by the crowds and the insulting remarks of the pavilion critics; but, notwithstanding any little drawbacks there might have been in this direction, Ranjitsinhji is more confident than ever of the success of the Englishmen in the test matches. Prince Ranjitsinhji, in conclusion, stated that he would not undergo the operation of his throat until after the third test match, as he was anxious to play at Adelaide.

A letter has been received from a young officer on duty beyond the North-West frontier of India in which reference is made to the pipers at Dargai. The officer had seen pipers Findlater and Milne in hospital at Rawal Pindi. The passage runs:—"Findlater says he was not playing 'The Cock of the North' when he was bowled over. He was playing 'The Haughs o' Cromdale,' the charge tune of the Gordons. He was first hit by a bullet on one of his boots, but was not hurt. The next bullet knocked off the end of his chanter, and the third went through his legs, and, as he says, brought him to the ground. He is getting on very well now. He is a fine broad Scottie, and it was quite a treat to hear him talking. 'The Haughs o' Cromdale' is one of the best known strathspeys, and is said to be a characteristic pipe tune, superior to 'The Cock o' the North.'"

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

**THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.**

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

GUARDIANSHIP.—MR. C. C. ORD, M.A., of Magdalen College, acts as Guardian to persons coming to England for Education, and gives information as to the methods available of Education. General and Professional. Address Secretary, INFORMATION OFFICE (opposite Examination Schools), 44, High Street, Oxford.

THE "WOLSELEY SERIES."
Edited by WALTER H. JAMES, late Captain R.E.

WITH THE ROYAL HEAD-QUARTERS IN 1870-71.

BY GENERAL VON VERDY DU VERNOIS.

With Portrait of the Author and Map.

Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

With a Preface by Field Marshal the Right Hon. Viscount WOLSELEY, K.P., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., Commander-in-Chief.

"The book is thoroughly interesting reading; it is written in a style so lucid and so free from technical detail that its interest never flags."—*Daily News.*

SET BY THE NEW MONOTYPE MACHINE.

INDIAN FRONTIER WARFARE.

BY MAJOR G. J. YOUNGHUSBAND,
Author of "The Relief of Chitral."

Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER, & Co., LIM., PATERNOSTER HOUSE, CHARING CROSS ROAD, W.C.

"INDIA." Vol. VIII. (1897.)

NOW READY.

BOUND IN CLOTH (post free), 8/6, *net cash.*

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of VOLUMES V. (1894), VI. (1895), *and* VII. (1896) *can be obtained at the same price. Remittances should accompany order.*

English Newspapers, Books, Magazines, &c.

WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS, Ltd.,

WHOLESALE AND EXPORT BOOKSELLERS, STATIONERS, AND NEWSVENDORS,

CANNON HOUSE, BREAM'S BUILDINGS, LONDON, ENGLAND.
(*Established* 1809.)

Orders for ENGLISH BOOKS, MAGAZINES, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, &c., punctually attended to, carefully packed, and despatched by first mails to Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, India, China, and throughout the world.
Remittance, or reference for payment in London, to accompany all orders. Advertisements and notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted in all the English Newspapers. Send for a Complete List of English and Foreign Newspapers, Magazines, &c. Also for Catalogue of Works and Text Books in the Oriental Languages.

6d. Weekly.] THE

"HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE.
SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR
INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & Co.

OFFICES: 55, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

Cheap Edition of Kaye and Malleson's Indian Mutiny.

SILVER LIBRARY EDITION.
6 Vols., Crown 8vo, Price 3/6 each.

HISTORY OF THE INDIAN MUTINY OF 1857-8.

BY
SIR JOHN KAYE, K.C.S.I., F.R.S.,
AND COLONEL MALLESON, C.S.I.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 1.

THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

(Being a series of Suggestions towards the prevention of Famine in India. Reprinted from "India.")

Obtainable from the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Price Sixpence, or Six Annas, net.

"Louene"

A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

For NEURALGIA, NERVOUS HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and other Nervous Troubles.

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."
The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for sleeplessness."

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to
THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.